

Hh. 924 E. 24.2
Z. 26.2

THE
Growth of Error:
BEING AN
EXERCITATION
CONCERNING

The Rise and Progress of Arminianism, and more especially Socinianism, both abroad, and now of late in England.

By a Lover of Truth, and Peace.

Psal. 7. 14. Behold he travelleth with Iniquity, and hath conceived Mischief, and brought forth Falshood.

L O N D O N,
Printed for John Salusbury, at the Rising Sun, in Cornhill, 1697.



111.1.1.111
III.11.111.111

Quædam in Elegiis

BY RICHARD
HERCULANUM



Coll. Gonv. et Caius

21... 520

THE

PREFACE.

WHEN I first observ'd, how suddenly the Socinian Heresie spread it self throughout the Nation, I could not satisfy my self, without making some Enquiry, how it came to pass, which I no sooner did, but perceiv'd, that Pretences, either to Reason, or Revelation, were not indeed the true Cause thereof so much as the Industry, Artifice, and Deceitful Methods of the Heresiarchists, who, being themselves struck Blind by the Divine Glory, which shines in the Mysteries of our Holy Religion,

The Preface,

and hardened also through the Innate Aversion, that is in us by Nature, unto the Self-abusing Truths in the Gospel, have made it their Province to pervert such, whom they found pliable to bow down to the Idol of a Religion of their making.

Some of their Methods I have detected, in the Ensuing Discourse; and, if God give leave, may do more hereafter. I have traced out some Foot-steps, in the Arminian Party, conducing towards the Socinian Cause, and am sorry to see how many, among the Orthodox, by their Heats, and Indiscretions, have contributed too much toward the Propagation of Errour, as well as they, that have run to the contrary Extreme in their opposing Soci-

The Preface.

Sociaian, and Arminian No-
tions.

Whether, in Imitation of the
Italian Combinators, there are
any amongst us have joyn'd them-
selves to the Orthodox, with
a Design to subvert the Truths,
they profess to own, and intro-
duce the Contrary they pretend a
Zeal against, I will not say :
But this will I say ; that, tho'
my Charity to Men, whose Prin-
ciples are very different from
what I hold (whom I believe
sincere, and open in their Enun-
ciations) is by many, that know
me, observ'd to be of a Lat-
tude, as they think, to a Fault ;
yet, not being able to abide any
of these Hypocritical, and De-
ceitful Trickings, in Matters
Religious, which, to my great

Sor-

The Preface.

Sortom I see now, tho' formerly
I could not believe, I shall, for
the unburthening my Conscience,
and for the sake of the Unwary,
show, that there are sundry Prin-
ciples advanced by Men of Re-
putation, among the sound in the
Faith, that do, in ther Tenden-
cy, leade to what these drive, who
are of the worst Sort, that is, the
English Socinians. And that
my Impartiality may appear, as
I have not, so will I not forbear
to express my just Indignation
against those Antinomian Dota-
ges, with their Mischievous Ef-
fects, which have been, not only
an Inlet to a loose Life, but the
Occasion of hurrying so many into
that wicked Heresie.

And when I do, as I intend,
this, I desire to be found one nei-
ther

The Preface.

ther so to affect to be Orthodox,
as to become censorious towards
my Brethren, who out of Judge-
ment, or Conscience differ from
me, in any tolerable Opinion ;
nor so afraid to be Heterodox,
as to decline the Examination,
or Reception of any Momentous
Point, that shall be offered me
by another, whereof I am convin-
ced, that it is first True, and
then also profitable either for Do-
ctrine, for Reproof, for Cor-
rection, or Instruction in Righ-
teousness to the Church of God.

March the 4th.
1697.

S. L.

ERRATA.

P Age 16. line 2. after Doctrine, read, in another
Instance. P. 17. l. 8. for Personality, r. Deity.
P. 63. l. 11. r. into. P. 81. l. 8. for confirming, r.
confirming. P. 83. l. 13. r. *subrogatum*, l. 14. r. *sub-
rogator*. P. 86. l. 1, 2. *dele*, or improve, l. 13. r.
1691. P. 124. l. 4. *dele*, till. P. 166. l. 28, 29. r.
For, to the End they might. P. 184. l. 23. r. which.
P. 195. l. 5. for one, r. on. P. 207. l. 2. after to,
add. be.

OF THE
GROWTH
OF
ERROR.

The Introduction.

GR E A T and Pernicious Errors having been insensibly spread through this Nation, an Account of their Rise, and Progress, and of the various and sundry Methods which have been taken for their Propagation, will not, I presume, be unnecessary; but rather a Cau-
tion to young Students, a prevention of their Fall, if not a means to recover others, that have been already tainted.

And, that I may be the more clear and distinct in the Account I give, I must, in the first place, mention the Errors my Dis-
course is of. For, though there is a great Cognition and Alliance between one Error and another, and the most opposite Heresies

B at



Of the Growth of Error.

at last; center in the same Point : Yet on an easie search, we shall find vast Differences between them, some greater, others less ; some in one, others in a contrary extream : But, in all, a Tendency to *Atheism* ; or, to use the new and finer word to express the same thing, *Deism*.

As there are gradual Recesses from Truth, the first, and least observable Turn from it, prepares the way for a greater ; but whilst near unto Truth, the Error is so like it, that it cannot be easily discern'd, or detected : And he, who makes the first step towards it, doth, er'e he is aware, slide into a greater ; and no sooner perceives where he is, but thinks himself too far gone to make an honourable Retreat ; whereby the Error which had it's first rise from *Inadvertency*, is upheld, and supported by the Lust, or sensual Interest of its Embracers.

Thus the *Amyraldians*, amongst whom, they who are sincere in what they Profess, as I doubt not, but there are many such, cannot see wherein they differ from their Brethren, except in the *way* and *method* of Explaining, and Defending the same Doctrine ; and therefore assume to themselves the Title of *New Methodists*, firmly adhering to old *Truths*.

Now, of these, how many slide into *Arminianism* ? and from thence pass over unto the Tents of *Sosinus* : Though they set up for Men of a *middle way*, between the extremes of *Calvin*, and the Excesses of *Van Harmine* ; yet, on the turn from the former, they

Of the Growth of Error.

3

they fall in so far with the latter in their Concessions, that it's become impossible for them to make a just Defence of what they hold in opposition to the other Parts of the *Arminian System*; and therefore at last, fall in entirely with them, and run their length.

In like manner the *Arminians*, who pretend a *middle way* between the *Orthodox* and *Socinian*, are in the twinkling of an Eye, fallen under *Socinus* his Banner; confounding Holy Scripture with their odd *Glosses*, and unintelligible Interpretations; framing Idea's of the Divine Being, so unworthy of it, as to provoke some to deny all reveal'd Religion, and others to turn *Atheists*.

Now 'tis the rise and progress of these mischievous Errors, embrac'd and propugnd by the followers of *Arminius*, and *Socinus*, that my Discourse is design'd to be of. Errors which, above Fifty years ago, on their first appearances am'g us, so alarm'd the Nation, as to put it into a very terrible Convulsion.

But since that day, through the force of an *Arminian Dose*, or some such like methods, we have fallen into an *Amazing* slumber, and no sooner doth any one awake out of it, but he is fill'd with wonder to behold the Nation to be so much *Socinian* and *Deist*; Nor can he easily imagine how it came to be so?

And, that we may obtain some Light about what it is, that hath influenced so great a part of Mankind to embrace these Errors; I have spent some thoughts about it, the Result of which, I offer to Consideration.

B 2

C H A P.

Of the Growth of Error.

C H A P. I.

*The first Particular, instance in as
an Occasion of Error, is a Preju-
dice against Gospel Doctrines,
because of their Mysteriousness.
The unreasonableness of this Preju-
dice discovered.*

TH E first thing I shall observe, which for the most part runs through all the rest, their Πατῶν Υἱοῦ, the chief Ground and Reason of their many Mistakes and Errors, is the *Prejudices* they have conceived against the *Mysteriousness* of our Holy Religion, which is founded on a grand Maxim, they have fixed as the Rule and Standard by which they'll try what is Truth, and what is Error : It's this, *Nothing is to be receiv'd into our Religion, as true, but what we have an Adequate and Comprehensive Idea of.*

When therefore, in our Systems, they meet with what transcends their understandings, they reject it as False, Absurd and Ridiculous.

This was the way of the *Remonstrants*, touching the Doctrine of particular Election, Reprobation, Irresistible Grace, &c. And of the *Socinians*, about Christ's satisfaction; the Incarnation of the Son of God; the Blessed Trinity, &c. And of the *Deists* against all reveal'd Religion; who by a Late Ingenious Author, in the Account he gives of

of the growth of *Deism*, is brought in ,
(saying) " Many Doctrines are made ne- pag. 20
"cessary to Salvation, which 'tis impossible to
"believe, because they are in their Nature
"Absurdities. I replyed (faith the Author)
"That these things were *Mysteries*, and so
"above our *Understandings*. But he asked
"me, to what end could an *Unintelligible*
"Doctrine be revealed ? Not to instruct, but
"to puzzle, and amuse. What can be the
"effect of an *Unintelligible Mystery* upon
"our minds, but only Amusement ? That
"which is only above Reason, must be above
"a *Rational Belief*; and must I be saved by
"an *Irrational Belief* ? If a proposition be
"inconsistent with its self, I cannot but be-
lieve it to be false.

But what doth this signify less, than that whatever transcends our *Understandings*, and is above our Reason, is an Absurdity, an Unintelligible Doctrine, fit only to puzzle and amuse , and the belief thereof Irrational ; so that, if they can't frame an *Adequate Idea*, or comprehend the whole of what their thoughts are conversant about ; if they can't reduce every thing to their own Pre-conceived order , and know it to perfection, it cannot in their opinion be true, but must, you see, be rejected as Absurd, False, and Irrational.

Though nothing more manifest and clear, than that the most enlarged Create Mind is Finite, Confin'd and Limited, and that there is a Being whose Essence and Perfections are Boundless, Unconfin'd , Incomprehensible .

Of the Growth of Error.

and past finding out ; and that it's impossible, and a contradiction to suppose a Finite Mind, able to comprehend what is Incomprehensible, or to get to the uttermost Bounds and Limits of what is Boundless, and Unlimitable ; yet with these Men the notion of a Deity, if we assign unto it Infinite Perfections, though essential thereunto, must be rejected , that is, they will believe nothing of God, unless they may take him to be such another as themselves, or themselves such as He is, as to the extent of his Being ; nor must any things be received into our Religion as true, that speak of his Transcendency, but must be esteemed as false and irrational, which amounts to thus much, *nothing in these matters must be believ'd to be true, but what is impossible to be so.*

Job 11. 7.

However, to an unbyassed mind, its most evident that there is a God, with whom are the *Secrets* of Wisdom, whose Being by searching cannot be found out, and who cannot be known to Perfection ? And that the *Life* of true Religion lyeth in the *knowledge of this God* ; and seeing an Adequate Knowledge, which is the same with a knowing to Perfection, is impossible, and yet there can be no true Religion without some knowledge of God ; the inference is *Manifest, Natural and Easie*, viz. That we may attain to a knowledge of God according to Truth, tho' we can't have an Adequate and Comprehensive knowledge of him, and that it's not sufficient to say, we can't comprehend it, therefore not true.

The

The most Momentous parts then of true Religion, being about the Perfections of God; such as his *Holiness*, his *Justice*, as distinct from his *Goodness* and *Mercy*, together with the unchangeableness of his Being, and the like, must be above our Reason too, and yet may be true: The same may be said of the Blessed Trinity and Incarnation of the Son of God; which are not more Transcendent and Incomprehensible than what we find to be said of the Essential Perfections of his Nature; nor is there any thing more difficult, and inscrutable in what is reveal'd about the Eternal Decrees, and the Modes of Divine Operation, than there is in the Doctrine of the Trinity, or Divine Attributes, and therefore our belief of them equally Rational.

Well then, if the points in Controversie between us are all reduced to one, or other of these heads, as really they are, for either to the Glorious Attributes, Personalities, Decrees or Modes of Divine Operations; the Doctrine of the Trinity, the Incarnation of the Son, the necessity of a proper satisfaction to Justice, and those other points about Election, Reprobation, Irresistible Grace, are reducible; a rejecting these Doctrines, because there is somewhat in them, exceeding the utmost extent of our Knowledge, and Unsearchable; or, which is the same because there is somewhat *Mysterious* in them, must be upon a reason, that necessarily obliges us to cast off the Belief of a Deity.

Besides, the Grand Maxim of those Gentlemen, who pretend so much to Reason, being, as I have already noted, this ; *that nothing is to be received into our Religion as true, but what we can Comprehend*; a spice of the first sin must be at the bottom, as the cause of all their Errors ; namely, an ambition to *be like unto God*, in his essential Perfections, which, in good earnest, is the import of this Maxim ; for it's impossible for them to know God to Perfection, unless the extent of their Understandings bears a proportion to his Perfections : So that in the issue, they cannot fairly deny the mysteries of our Holy Religion ; but on a Topick, whereby they make themselves equal with God.

Thus you see, that by opposing our Holy Religion, for the sake of the *Mysteries* there are in it ; they are driven either to the denial of a God, or to the making themselves Gods; either of which is, of all Absurdities, the most vile and gross.

But to follow the Deist in his way of Arguing: He makes a *Mystery* to be an *unintelligible Doctrine*, that can only puzzle and amuse, because in it there is somewhat above our Reason ; whereas it's very clear, that the Doctrine may have somewhat *unsearchable* in it, and yet be intelligible enough ; thus when it's said Man's understanding is Finite, but God's is Infinite, I clearly and distinctly enough perceive the meaning hereof, and have as good reason to believe God's to be *Infinite*, as I have that Man's is Finite ; and tho' there is somewhat included in Infinity, that is

Of the Growth of Error.

9

is above my Reason, yet the Revelation, which faith, that the Divine Understanding is Infinite, and unsearchable, is to instruct, and not to puzzle or amuse.

Once more, seeing God, whose Perfections are Infinite, in creating all things, hath left such impresses of his Infinity on the things Created, that the profoundest Philosopher, in his Closet searches into their Nature, sees enough to conclude, there is somewhat in them, unsearchable, and past finding out, which to me is an uncontrollable Argument, that an Infinitely wise Agent is their Maker: Even so, when I read the Holy Scriptures, look into the Doctrines therein contained, there are such clear and distinct Revelations of sundry Glorious Mysteriess, touching infinite Wisdom, and the other Divine perfections, that I cannot but with strongest Assurances conclude, that God is their Author too.

An *Anis-Trinitarian*, in a Letter to the Clergy of both Universities, concerning the ^{Aug. 33.} *Trinity*, and the *Athanasian Creed*, doth, I confess, hope to extricate himself out of this difficulty; by distinguishing between the *things themselves* and the *manner of them*; affirming, that the things themselves, that is, God's Eternity, Infinity, Omnipresence, are intelligible, but the *manner of them* is impossible to be apprehended. "The Idea's
" (faith he) we have of God's *Eternity, Infi-*
" *nity, Omnipresence, Omniscience*, and all
" that we are required to believe concerning
" them, are so clear and distinct, that an or-
" dinary

Of the Growth of Error.

" ordinary Capacity apprehends what we mean,
 " when we say, God is Eternal, Infinite,
 " Omniscient, Omnipresent, though these
 " things themselves are intelligible, yet the
 " manner of them is impossible to be appre-
 hended, and as we are now framed, we are
 " not capable of having it revealed to us;
 " and none but a blind *Metaphysician*, who
 " pretends to know all things, but really
 " knows nothing, would be so vain, as to
 " attempt to explain the *manner* of God's
 " Omnipresence, or his Omniscience. It is
 " no wonder there are insuperable difficulties
 " about the *manner* of things of this Nature,
 " when there are as great difficulties in ap-
 prehending the *manner* of Nature's Opera-
 ting in the most common things, which
 " things none disbelieveth, because he does
 " not apprehend how they are done. Who
 " disbelieveth there is such a Creature as Man,
 " though he does not know how he was
 " formed? But it is quite otherwise when
 " we cannot apprehend the things themselves,
 " there is then an absolute impossibility of be-
 " lieving them.

A perfect Idea of the things themselves,
 that is, of Eternity, Infinity, &c. (he saith)
 we may have, but not of the *manner*; where-
 as if the Reason, why we can't have a perfect
 Idea of the *manner* of Infinity, Eternity, &c.,
 can be no other, than what makes it as im-
 possible to have an Adequate Idea of Infinity,
 Eternity, &c. the things themselves; it
 cannot be more possible to apprehend Eterni-
 ty, than the *manner* of it. And it's manifest
 that

Of the Growth of Error.

11

that the difficulty of apprehending the *manner*, arises from its *Infinity*, we cannot have a perfect Idea of the *manner* of Eternity, because of the Infinity is in it ; and as we can't comprehend how God is Eternal, neither can we have a perfect Idea of *Eternity*. It's true, the *Doctrine* of Eternity, Omnis-
cience, &c. is intelligible, we know what we mean when we discourse of Eternity, &c. But then must add, that we mean by Eternity somewhat with respect to duration that exceeds the Bounds of the most enlarged Create understanding, of which we cannot have a perfect Idea.

This *Distinction* then between the *things themselves*, and their *manner* is in this Case insufficient to solve the difficulty ; for there is as much of Infinity in the *things themselves*, as is in *their manner*, and therefore equally above our Reason ; and the impossibility to frame a perfect Idea of either, is the same. The *Nature of God*, is as *unsearchable*, as his *ways are past finding out*.

Besides, if we apply this distinction to the *Doctrine of the Trinity*, it must be acknowledged, that the Idea we have of a *Person* in the *Blesed Trinity*, is as Intelligible as any one of the Divine Attributes ; and that the difficulty, in *Controversie* is about the *manner how three persons can be in the unity of Essence*, not in the *things themselves*. A *Trinity of Persons* is as intelligible, as a *Variety of Attributes*, and the *manner of Conciliating a variety of Attributes*, with absolute simplicity, is as impossible as the conciliating

Of the Growth of Error.

liating a Trinity of Persons with Unity of Essence.

The Error, therefore of these Men, lyeth in their insinuating that it's not impossible to have a perfect Idea of Eternity, Infinity, Omnipotence, &c. the *things themselves*, but of their *manner*, when as the one and the other is equally impossible, and that touching the Trinity, the Controversie is not about the *manner*, but the *thing itself*; and yet nothing more evident than the *thing itself*, to wit, the Trinity hath nothing more insuperable in it, than a variety of Attributes, and that in reality the objections are in this Case raised from the *manner* of the *thing*, not from the *thing itself*: It is about *how* it can be, not *what* it is.

Another therefore is more bold, avering, that he can comprehend Infinity, and whatever is truly predicated of God; but not being able to comprehend the *Trinity*, it cannot be true; whereby his own understanding is not only made the measure of Divine Truths; but according to what I have already suggested, he himself made equal with God, or the Infinite God made such another as himself.

1. Tim. 3. 16. When I read, *that great is the Mystery of Godliness; God manifest in the Flesh; justified in the Spirit; seen of Angels; preached unto the Gentiles; believed on in the World; receivid up into Glory.* And when I reflect on those Sacred Texts, which speak of the *Eternal Generation of the Son; his being in the Bosome of the Father from everlasting; his*

Prov. 8. 22. to 31.

his Revealing the Father to Us clearly, that we with open Face beholding, as in a Glass Mat. 11. the Glory of the Lord, are changed into ^{27.} the same Image from Glory unto Glory, ^{2 Cor. 3. 18.} even as by the Spirit of the Lord : And ^{1 Cor. 13.} now tho' we see but through a Glass dark-^{22.}

ly, yet shall we hereafter see face to face. I say, when I meditate on these Parts of the Holy Revelation, whilst I am convinc'd, that these and such like Texts, speak of things Mysterious, and Unsearchable, past findingout; yet am I hereby instructed to believe and hope, that though the Saints shall never know the Almighty to Perfection, yet shall they be raised to a clearer, and more distinct knowledge of those now unconceiveable, as well as ineffable Glories.

And when I read in the Writings of some Men, who, in Reasoning about other things, are strong and nervous, yet weak and feeble in their arguings against the profound Mysteries of Christ's Gospel; I cannot but clearly perceive a Truth in those words of the Apostle; "the Natural Man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are Foolishness unto him, neither can he know them because they are Spiritually discerned, for which reason these Men are rather to be pityed than envied; prayed for, than Reviled; that, if twould please the Lord they might come to the acknowledgment of the Truth, and see how great their Folly was, in making their Confin'd Understandings, the measure of all Knowledge, which undoubtedly is done by them

1 Cor. 2. 14. 2 Tim. 2. 25.

Of the Growth of Error.

them that reject all things as Absurd and False, which are *above*, or *beyond* their Reason.

But the *Deist* adds, “ ‘Twas once to serve
“ a Turn against the *Papists*, that our Church
“ held all Doctrines necessary to save Souls,
“ were plainly Revealed in *Scripture*. How
“ could you lay plainly revealed, unless you
“ understood the Revelation?

And why to serve a Turn, and that *once*
‘twas so, as if we had now forsaken our
Principles, and profess'd to believe *unimedi-
gible Revelations*, whereas 'tis our constant
Judgment, that the Doctrines necessary to
Salvation are not dark and obscure, but
Clear, Evident, and Perspicuous, that what
is not clearly delivered in the Scripture, is
not of indispensable Necessity to be Known
and Believed, and Consistently assert, that
the *Mysteries* our Adversaries reject, are
clearly revealed. The Revelation is very
Plain, Clear, and Open; though the
things Reveal'd are *Mysterious*, Inscrutab-
le, and past finding out: And yet these
Mysterious Points are in themselves Great,
Glorious, True and Evident; and only be-
cause our Understandings are Finite, Weak
and Feeble, are we unable to comprehend
them. This Truth is by a Learned Divine
thus Illustrated. “ We can see other things
“ by the Light of the Sun, better than we
“ can see the *Sun it self*; not because the
“ Sun is less visible and discernable in it
“ self, but because our *Visive Faculty* is
too weak to bear its Resplendent Light.

The

The *Deists*, mistake therefore, (into which the *Socinian* hath led him) is complicated, and lyeth in a *Confounding* the *Revelation* with the *thing Revealed*, and in a *Perversion*, that because the *Mystery* is past our Knowing to Perfect on, therefore not in it self Evident, Clear, or Knowable : And if not to be fully known by vain Mortals, it cannot, he thinks, be true, but must be False, Absurd and Irrational : And thus, according to the Scripture-Revelation, being *Puff'd up in his fleshly Mind*, intrudes into Col. 2. 10; those things, which he hath not seen ; and, contrary to the Apostolical Prohibition, thinks of himself more highly than he ought Rom. 12. 3. to think ; is resolved to penetrate into the Secrets of the Almighty, to make his own mistaken, fanciful, and narrow Understanding the Measure, Rule, and Standard of Truth ; and like a Man, who is so weak as to imagine his *visive Faculty* able to bear the Resplendent Light of the Sun, looks on it till his Eyes are so Dazled, that he cannot rightly judge of Colours ; even so the Presuming *Deist* and *Anti-Trinitarians*, who think they can look into the Deep things of God, and Comprehend the Divine Perfections, are overcome by the Glory of Divine Mysteries, their Minds darkened, and they plunged into the Depths of Error ; and thus, in a Measure, 'tis with others that have Erred from the Truth.

C H A P. II.

*Radicated Prejudices against Gospel
Doctrines, ^{and the cause of} Error.
This seen in the Opposition Man
makes to Christ's Righteousness
for Justification.*

II. **A**nother thing that occasions *Error*, is a *Radicated prejudice* against *Gospel Doctrines*, as their *Tendency* is to *Exalt God, Depress man, and engage him to acts of greatest self-denial*.

The Holy Ghost, having with much clearness, shown the insufficiency of Mans best Righteousness for Justification, and his inability to think a good Thought ; or do the least good Work ; and, that the Righteousness of Christ, who is *God-Man*, can alone justify a believing Sinner, and the Omnipotent Spirit alone enable us to believe ; these Doctrines, though they are a display of the manifold Wisdom of God, of the Glory of his Holiness, Justice, and Mercy, and an illustrious Evidencement of the satisfaction, and Merit of the Death and obedience of Christ, *God-Man*, as also of the Powerful Operation of the third Person in the Blessed Trinity ; yet, because they lay us low, discovering the Imperfection, Insufficiency, and Vanity of our own Endeavours ; they reject these Truths, exposing them, as whereby a Door had been open'd to let in all manner

manner of Vice and Licentiousness ; and rather than they will submit themselves to the Righteousness of God, or be owing to the power of the Holy Ghost, they'll venture *first* to publish that the believing in God the Son , and in God the Holy Ghost, is not necessary to Salvation , and at length go on to deny the ~~Personality~~ both of Son and Spirit.

As *Adam*, on the Fall, instead of seeking unto God, *leaned* to his own understanding, and strength ; so it hath been ever since, the way of his Off-spring. In the Old Testament instances of Mens Glorying in their own Power, and performances, are innumerable ; and the Apostle *Paul* assures us in the *New*, that this was the way of his Kindred the *Jews* : And ever since those days it hath been the general method of *Hereticks* to trust in their own Righteousnes , and despise others.

This they found to be a Notion, as plausible, as it was to their Corrupt Minds agreeable ; and because the Orthodox , who preised a Holy Life and Conversation as necessary to Salvation, could not put their own Obedience into the place and room of Christ's, it hath been the common practice of the Erroneous to reproach them as Enemies to Holyness and Mortification ; as tho' they held, that we might live as lewdly as we listed, and die as we lived, yet in the end obtain Salvation through the Death and Righteousness of Christ.

C

And,

And, as this was the burden of their Writings ; in like manner, 'twas the care of the most Eminent *Heresarchs*, to give an agreeable Example, by which means Multitudes of the weaker, but more zealous sort were ensnared to embrace their Errors. And tho' at this time the Professors of *Arminian* and *Socinian* Errors have in this respect degenerated, and thereby have lost the advantage of this pretence ; yet *Socinus*, and after him *Gichtingius*, with many others, valued themselves upon the *Holiness* of them of their way, which they assign'd to the *Power* and Influence of their Principles.

However, these Gentlemen not being able intirely to erase those Idea's, which at first were implanted in their Souls, about the *Holiness* and *Righteousness of God*, cannot but profess to believe, that there is no Justification to be had in the sight of God without a perfect Righteousness, and to the end they may the more easily quiet an awaken'd Conscience, without the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, they either hold that the *Law of Works* is *Abolished*, and a *New Law* Erected : A *New*, a *more easie Law*, so fram'd, and squar'd to their corrupt Natures, as to make their Defective *Obedience* a *perfect Gospel Righteousness*, fully answering the *New Rule* they have invented : Or, affirm, That their Faith, though it falls short of the Law, is nevertheless, counted by God, for a compleat Performance of it, as a late Author, supposed to deny the *Dinity* of *Jesuſ Christ*, hath expressed it in his

his *Reasonableness of Christianity*, who
faith, "The *Law of Works*, is that Law,
" which requires Perfect Obedience, without
" any Remission or Abatement. — The
" Language of this Law is, *Do this*, and
" *Live, Transgress and Die*. — Those P. 20.
" that Obey are Righteous; those that in
" any part Disobey, are Unrighteous, and
" must not expect Life, the *Reward of*
" *Righteousness*. But by the *Law of Faith*,
" *Faith* is allowed to supply the Defect of
" full Obedience, and so the Believers are
" admitted to Life and Immortality as if
" they were *Righteous*. — The *Moral* P. 22.
" *Law* (which is every where the same, the
" Eternal Rule of Right) obliges Chris-
" tians and all Men every where, and is to
" all Men the standing Law of Works.
" But Christian Believers have the *Priva-*
" *lege* to be under the *Law of Faith* too;
" which is that Law whereby God justifieth
" a Man for *Believing*, though by his
" Works he be not Just, or Righteous, i. e.
" though he come short of *Perfect Obedi-*
" *ence to the Law of Works*. God alone
" does, or can justify, or make just those,
" who by their Works are not so; which he
" doth, by *counting their Faith for Righte-*
" *ousness*, i. e. for a compleat Performance
" of the *Law*. So far this Learned Au-
thor, who, in Opposition to the former, that
destroys the Old, and invents a New Law so
framed, as to turn our Defective into a Per-
fect Obedience; doth, first, by Reasons *In-*
vincible, Establish the *Law of Works* in all
its

Of the Growth of Error.

its Parts : and then adds a *New Law* unto it, and God's Gracious Esteeming our Faith, as fully answering the Law of Works, and so stretcheth our *Defective Faith* to the utmost length of *perfect Obedience*. As the one brings down the Law to our Imperfection, the other raises our Imperfection to the same height with the Law : But so long as the *Law of Works* remains in its Strength, there can be no *New Rule* brought down to make Sin cease to be Sin, or turn a *Defective* into a *Perfect Obedience*. And so long as the All-knowing God Judges of things as they are, Imperfect Faith can never pass, at his *Tribunal*, for a *Compleat Performance of the Law*, there must be then a *Perfect Righteousness* fully answering the *Law of Works*, or no *Justification*. And it's more easie, as well as more conform to Holy Scripture, to believe, That the *Righteousness of Christ*, which consists in a full Performance of the Law of Works, is given to all that have Faith, and by *Donation* is really made theirs, and being really theirs, may be *justly esteem'd to be theirs*, and they justified by it.

But these Men, if not mistaking, yet surely misrepresenting the old Doctrine, as covered with innumerable Absurdities, do not only drive their Admirers off from Examining it, but so fill their Minds with Prejudices against it, as to make them willing to take up with any thing, rather than with the Truth, especially in a Case so pleasing, because somewhat of their own is made their Justifying Righteousness. C H A P.

C H A P. III.

The deceitful Methods used by Heretics a cause of Error, more generally proposed : The approaches of Socinus, and his Followers towards the Orthodox. The real difference, there is between them in Fundamentals. A Reflection on these Methods. Arminians take the same course, &c.

S E C T. I.

The deceitful methods used by Heretics more generally proposed. Their rise in the Apostles days. The deceitful Methods, used by some Men of great Learning, is another Cause of the growth of Error.

TH E R E being some Foundation-Truths so fully, clearly and distinctly reveal'd in Holy Writ ; as to command the Assent of the Church Universally in all Ages, (excepting that in which the Christian World became *Arian,*) they, who have been their chief Opposers, have retained the *Words* and *Phrases*, by which those Truths have been transmitted down unto us ;

C 3 and

Of the Growth of Error.

and introduced their particular Opinions, by an Heterodox sense they have fixed on them. And when *suspected*, that they might the more effectually conceal their Errors, have *subscribed* sound *Catechisms* and *Confessions*, whereby they have had the fairer opportunity to instil their *Dogmata* into the minds of *Youth*, and other less studied Persons, and under the Notion of being firm Adherers to the common Faith, have engaged them to a closure with the unsoundest Parts of their Heretical Scheme.

In the Apostles days, they who err'd from the Faith, attempted by *good words*, and *fair speeches* to seduce the simple, *Rom. 16. 18.*

Digres. de nova Theol. Helmstad. Reg. Sync. bish. pag. 88. And *Irenæus*, who lived near that time *Paul* wrote his Epistle to the *Romans*, describing the Hereticks of that Age, as *Calovius* observes, tells us that they speak like unto the Orthodox.

This was the way *Arius*, after he was driven from *Alexandria* for his Heresie, took to be restored to the Emperour's favour; tho' he retained his Error, yet subscribed a sound confession of Faith, as 'tis reported by *Socrates* in his *Ecclesiastical History*. Lib. I. c. 25, &c.

Pelagius, when conven'd before a Provincial Synod at *Diospolis*, in *Pelæstine*, at which Fourteen Bishops were present, but *not his Accusers*, doth concur with the Orthodox in condemning his own Opinions; but as *Vossius* out of St. *Austin* observes, he did it very *deceitfully*. *Pelagianam sententiam pectore quidem ficto, sed tamen Catholicos*

licos judices timens Pelagius ipse damnavit.
And as the same *Poffius* adds, St. *Hierom* Hierom. E.
calls this Synod a *miserable* one; because, pift. 79.
tho' they err'd not in Doctrines, yet not dis-
cerning the falsehood of the man, they Err'd
in the *Judgment* they past on him, who
being better known at *Rome*, could not con-
ceal his Treacherous Endeavours, but was
soon detected by the Bishops of that place.

This being the common practice of Hereticks, St. *Cyprian* compares them to Apes, saying they imitate the Orthodox as Apes do Men.

Now this having been a very successful, as well as a most pernicious Artifice, in constant practice amongst the Ancients; the *Socinian* and *Arminian Leaders*, whose Reputation hath been, and is still so great, that the respect multitudes have for them, in regard to their Candor, and Integrity, which is supposed to be conspicuous in the Representations they make of their own, and their Adversaries Principles, have walk'd in the same Path, as I hope in the following History, with some clearness to detect and make manifest.

SECT. II.

*The seeming Approaches of Socinus,
and his Followers towards the Orthodoxy.*

THE *Socinians*, altho' they deny a *Trinity of Persons* in the *God-head*, the *Divinity*

vinity of Christ, and the Personality of the Holy Ghost; Christ's Satisfaction and Merit; Justification by the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness; the work of the Spirit in Conversion, &c. Yet in their Apologies, Confessions, and other Writings, they give us their Opinions in such words, as if they held all these necessary Doctrines.

*Specimen
Refut.Crell.
de satisf. p.
3. 5.*

*Ruar. E.
pist. Selectt.
par. 1.pag.
464.*

Ruarus, who is justly esteemed by the excellent Velthusius, to be one of the most Learned Socinians, amongst the Reasons annexed to the First Century of his Select Epistles, persuading the Papists to express more candor towards them, closes with this Protestation. " That they do heartily believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; " that they Baptize in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and according to knowledge an Unity in this Trinity; that they esteem Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, and the true God, and as such worship him; that they believe Christ to have abundantly satisfied the Will of the Father in all things, which he imposed on him to do, and suffer for our sins, and so by the Victime of his Body hath expiated them.

In an Epistle to Heino Veglerus, this Learned Ruarus thus writes. " My most intimate Friends have oft heard me Profess, that in most humble manner I adore the Divine Nature in Christ, (and am most hearty in acknowledging his true Merit and Satisfaction made for us, altho these words are not in Scripture.) I Challenge 'em

*Ruar. E.
pist. 16. p.
107.*

“ ‘em all to accute me if they can for denying the *Hypostasis*, or Subsistence of the Holy-Ghost, or for rejecting Infant-Baptism, or for placing our Righteousness in the Merit of our Works, or any thing like it.

In an Epistle to *Frederick Schofferus*, whose perversion *Ruarus* doth endeavour, after he had advised him to cast off those prejudices, he had received with his Mothers Milk, beseeches him to consider, “ that they do not deny *Christ's satisfaction*, but hold that he *satisfied the will of his Father*, both by *doing*, and *suffering* all those things imposed on him by the Father for the sake of us, and our Sins; *Ruar. E-* whence it comes to pass, that our sins are *pist. 23. p.* pardon'd, and Eternal Life given us. He ^{146, 147,} is more full in what he writes unto *Nigrinus*, “ for (faith he) I do acknowledge that the Obedience, which *Christ*, as the Head of all the Elect, did render unto God in his Life, and much rather in his Death, was a sufficient, or full price for our Sins, and so equivalent to the sufferings, which by our Sins we had deserved. But that I may more distinctly deliver my thoughts concerning the Fruits of Christ's Death, I will reduce what I have taken out of the Holy Scriptures to Three Heads, answerable to his Three-fold Office. For Christ being the Chief Prophet of God, even as was *Moses*, published a New Law unto the People, and whatever he Taught, Commanded, Promised, or Did, when alive,

“ alive, he by his Death, Eminently Confirmed, *Sealed*, and Sanction’d, whereby we are obliged to believe him, and obey his *Laws*. And God himself engaged to perform all that Christ hath promised in his Name. Touching the *Priestly Office* which lyeth in making *Prayers* for the People, and *Sacrificing*, that is to say, Killing the Victim, and then according to the Law offering it for the Expiation of Sin, Christ a little before his Death pouring out most ardent Prayers to God, on behalf of all that then did, or after should believe, and entering into Heaven through Death, doth now make Intercession for them, and freely offer’d up himself upon the Cross, as one to be made an *Atonement Victim*; and with this Victim of his Body prepared for an *Oblation*, by Death he entered into the Heavens, as into the Holy of Holies, and offer’d up this *Sacrifice* of himself without Spot, by the Eternal Spirit unto God, who is amongst the *Cherubims*; or rather with the Myriads of Angels, there appearing for ever before the Throne of the Divine Majesty, to expiate the Sins of the People, and procure their Pardon. And that he might enter on the Execution of his *Kingly Office*, whereby he doth all things which belong to the Salvation of the Elect, defending and freeing them from all Evil, and at length making them meet for the partaking of Spiritual and Heavenly Blessings: He did, by rendring Obedience to

“ the

“ the Death open a way, whence we owe all
“ unto Christ, who so readily dyed for us.

“ The Causes also of our Salvation
“ may be considered as *Three-fold*. The
“ *First*, the freest Grace of the Immortal
“ God? The *Second* is Christ, who as our
“ Head hath undertaken for his Body with
“ God: The *Last* is our Faith and Obedi-
“ ence towards God, wrought by the Spirit
“ of Regeneration.

To this of *Ruarus*, I will annex what *Slichtingius*, the *Polonian Knight*, hath, in the *Polonian Confession*, and *Apology*. In the *Preface* to the *Confession*, they say,
“ That the Apostle's Creed is most Ancient,
“ containing the most pure, and Apostolical
“ Truth, as *first* delivered; that therefore
“ in Publishing the Faith of their Churches
“ to express their *Consent* with the whole
“ World, they keep most close unto *this*
“ *Creed*, and although they esteem the third
“ Part about the *Holy Ghost*, not to be so
“ Ancient, as the other two Parts, yet they
“ Profess, that they believe all contained in
“ it to be most true. And in their Expo-
“ sition of what is said about Christ's being
“ *Dead*, they declare, That then Christ's
“ Soul was made an *Offering* for Sin, that
“ all those Scriptures which assign the Ex-
“ piation and *Remitission* of our Sins to the
“ Blood of Christ, do make it clear, that
“ Christ's Death was *tanquam victimam pia-*
“ *cularis*, that is, as an *Expiatory Sacri-*
“ *fice*, or *Victim*.

Besides on these Words, [*the Remission of Sin*] it's thus : " We believe all past Sins, how gross soever, and all Sins of Infirmitiy committed after the Acknowledging of the Truth, are through the Obedience, Blood and Oblation of Christfully forgiven them, that have the Communion of Saints formerly spoken of; For this Reason, (say they,) *Justification is not by the Works of the Law, or our own proper Merit.* That this Remission of Sins, and Justification is on our part obtained by *Faith, and Repentance, and continued unto us by the Fruits thereof.*

Vid. Cur-
sel. Quatern. confession, with which *Stephen Curcellæus* twists
Differ. Theo. honest *Maresius*, as what is more Sound
Adver. Ma- than what is embraced by him and other *Cal-*
res. Differ. *vinists.*

4. Sect. 13.

Slichtingius in his *Apology*, (which was occasion'd by an *Edict* of the *Lords of Holland* and *West Friesland*, for the suppreſſing all *Socinian Prints and Conventicles*, which they ſent out in purſuance of the Supplication made unto them by the Deputies of the *Synod of South and North Holland*, approved of by *Triglandius, Heidanus, and Cocceius*, Professors at *Leiden*; I ſay, in this *Apology*, he doth his utmoſt by using *Orthodox Phrases*, to make their Errors look, as though they differ'd but little from the *Common Faith*; " For (ſaith he,) " twas never in our thoughts to deny the " Unity of the Trinity; that we do with " our whole Heart Believe, and openly own " the

“ the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be
“ One, that we confess Christ to be God,
“ ascribing to him that Divinity, which ap-
“ pertains to the Son of God, the like of the
“ Holy Ghost. And whereas we are charg'd
“ for Denying Christ's Satisfaction, if it be <sup>Apol. pro
verit. accu-</sup>
“ meant of the thing which in the Holy ^{sat. p. 12.}
“ Scriptures is assigned unto it, we do most
“ firmly believe, that Jesus Christ, to the end
“ he might obtain for us the Remission of
“ Sins, hath so far satisfied the Divine
“ Will, that there is nothing wanting to a P. 24.
“ most full and Compleat Satisfaction.

“ As to the Merit of Christ, if by it
“ they mean his Perfect Obedience, and
“ Righteousness, we do freely confess, that
“ Christ's Obedience for our obtaining Eter-
“ nal Life doth much more abound to us,
“ than Adam's Sin to our Condemnation, Apol. 25.
“ not excluding our Obedience, which all
“ that have received Faith and the Spirit of
“ Christ, have, more or less, whose Defects
“ are through the Grace of God supplied by
“ Christ's most Compleat and Perfect Obe-
“ dience.

“ We acknowledge, that we are Sinners, Apol. p. 53.
“ and fall very short of the perfect Rule of
“ Righteousness, and therefore fly unto
“ Christ, that we may be justified by him,
“ without the Deeds of the Law.—
“ nor do we by the Faith of Christ destroy
“ the Law, as it respects Moral Precepts,
“ which is the true Righteousness, but e-
“ stablish it.

“ That

Of the Growth of Error.

P. 26. “ That Conversion is by the *Power* of
“ the *Spirit* we never denied, unless as held
“ by such, as make Men to be but as Stocks,
“ utterly rejecting and banishing from the
“ Christian Religion all *Vertue*, and *Vice*,
“ *Rewards* and *Punishments*, leaving it de-
“ stitute of all Encouragements to true *Piety*.

P. 87. “ We trust not to the Strength or Power of
“ our own Will, knowing that unless it be
“ excited, cherished, and helped by a Hea-
“ venly Power, we cannot so much as *Will*,
“ much less *Perform* any thing — and seeing
P. 65. “ we can neither begin, nor finish any thing
“ without the help of God’s Grace, we lift
“ up our Prayers and Thanksgivings unto
“ God — nor do we deny the Resurrection,
“ but with the Apostle we have our Hope in
“ God, touching the *Resurrection* of the
“ *Dead*, both of the *Just* and *Unjust*, be-
“ lieving that the *Just* shall be raised to the
“ Joys of an Eternal Life, and the *Unjust*
“ to the Punishment of Everlasting Fire,
“ wherefore knowing the Terrore of the
“ Lord, we persuade Men.

P. 76. “ *Frzipevius*, a *Knight*, and *Counsellor*
of the *Elector* of *Brandenburg*, in his *A-
polo^{gy} for Afflicted Innocence*, directed to the
Elector, and Supreme Prince of *Prussia*,
seems to speak as *Orthodoxly* as any one
could wish. “ For, (saith he) we with
“ due Honour receive the Doctrine of the
“ *Trinity*, the Father, Son, and Holy
“ *Spirit*, in whose *Name* we are Baptized:
“ Concerning the *Divinity* of our Lord,
“ We acknowledge him to be *properly*, and
“ *truly*

*Frzipev.
Apol. pro
Innocen.*

“ truly speaking the only Begotten Son of
“ God, not merely because of the *Luminis-
“ on*, and *Omnipotence* given to him, but
“ because of that *Divine Nature*, which
“ he received by the voluntary Generation of
“ his most loving Father, in which, the
“ Character and Image of the Divine Sub-
“ stance of the Father shines, and so we
“ Worship, Adore, and Invoke him as the
“ *True God*, even by Nature, in a proper
“ Sence, now and for ever Bleſſed. Then
“ of the Holy Ghost he says. Nothing can
“ by any Man be ſaid ſo ſublime concerning
“ the Holy Spirit, which we do not willingly
“ admit, ſo that the *Name* and *Title* of
“ the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ
“ remain peculiar to the Omnipotent Person
“ of the Father : Then concerning the
“ *Merit of Christ's Death* We acknow-
“ ledge the Merit of the Death of Christ,
“ and our Redemption effected by his most
“ precious Blood poured out, but ſo as that
“ the Grace and Favour of Forgivenefs, re-
“ main owing to his most merciful Father.

He is positive, that touching Magistracy, they confess with the Apostle *Paul*, that the Magistrate is the Minister of God to Punifh, by the Sword, evil Doers, and protect the Innocent, and that they are not to be removed out of the Church of Christ, that in the other Articles of Religion, they hold nothing Blafphemous, Heretical, or Absurd, not daring to deviate in the leaſt from the *Apostle's Creed*, and *Holy Scriptures*.

Who-

Whoever considers that what is here delivered by this Author, is done *Apologetically* to put a stop to the troubles they endured, or at least, to get 'em mitigated, cannot but concur with me in concluding, that He uses these *Orthodox Phrases*, to the end He, and they might be esteemed as Men *Sound in the Faith*, far from holding the Heresies they were charged with, and therefore no way deserving the Severities, that were only due to Blasphemous Hereticks ; and yet, (as we shall hereafter shew) as there is a mixture of Unsound Expressions, even in the Places, where he speaks thus of the Trinity, and Christ's Divinity, so doth he otherwhere deny these Doctrines.

Enyedius, Superintendent of the *Unitarian* Churches in *Transilvania*, in his *Preface* to his *Explication* of those places in the Old and New *Testament*, produced by the Orthodox to prove the *Trinity*; doth

Enyedius.
Praef.ad ex-
plicat. Loc.
V. & N. Test.

positively aver, " That the whole they believe is owned by *Papists*, *Lutheran*, " and *Calvinist*, Namely, That *Jesus Christ* " called the *Son of God*, the Father Almighty, " Maker of the Heavens and the Earth ; " even he who was conceived by the Holy " Ghost, and Born of the Virgin, the Man " Christ Jesus is the One, and only Medi- " diator between God, and Men, by whose " Death Salvation is procured for us, and " through whom both Jew and Gentile " have Access to the Father, and in whose " Name, by the Holy Ghost we obtain a " Pardon, and an Assurance of Eternal Life. " This

" This is the summ of the New Testament-
" Doctrine, and the Faith, which we con-
" stantly Profess, and Defend, And who
" dares deny it? Do the Papist, Lutheran,
" or Calvinist? No, by no means.

I could easily add many other *Socinian* Authors, speaking after this very way, as if they Disented not from the Orthodox in any Important Points: But these being enough to Evince the Truth of my Assertion, I will go on to shew, that notwithstanding these seeming Approaches towards the Truth, they are at the utmost distance from it, denying those glorious Doctrines, they would be thought to embrace.

S E C T. III.

The real Distance there is between
the *Socinian* and *Orthodox*. That
the Difference lyeth in Fundamen-
tals.

THAT they deny the *Trinity of Persons* in the God-head, the *Divinity of Jesus Christ*, and *Personality of the Holy Spirit* is the Burthen of all their Writings. Who can cast his Eye on *Socinus*, *Slichtingius*, *Crellius*, *wolzogenius*, and *Smalcius*, and not see how much they exposé these Doctrines? *Enjedinus* hath a large Quarto to prove, that not one Word either in the Old or New Testament, can be found to favour the *Trinity*, or the *Divinity of Christ*.

Franciscus Davidis, and *George Blan-*
drata, in their *Refutation of George Ma-*
ajor, insinuate, that this Blessed Doctrine is
a Papal Antichristian Invention. The
Blasphemies of Servetus may be seen in *Cal-*
vin's Refutation of them, but too vile at
this time to be mentioned. And in *Calvin's*
Explication of Valentinus Gentilis his Per-
fidiouſneſs, there is an account of his Oppo-
sition to the same Truths. And whoever
will, may consult Sandius his Antitrinita-
rian Bibliothec, where is a large Catalogue
of Socinian Writers against the Trinity, &c.

And *Christ's Satisfaction*, which is real-
ly subverted by the denial of his Divinity,
is also expressly Exploded. Though they
grant a Satisfaction, the Payment of a
Price, the enduring a Punishment, a Punish-
ment equipollent to what we have by our
Sins deserved, yet they mean quite another
thing than what is generally understood by
us; which, as soon as they have, by the use
of Orthodox Expressions, ensnared their
Readers to put a favourable Sence upon their
Writings, they discover, Insinuating, that
the Satisfaction, they, and as they will have
it, the Holy Scriptures are for, is not
to God's Justice, it is not properly by pay-
ing a Λιτέρα Price, a full Price, nor an E-
quivalent to what we deserved: It is only
a Satisfaction improperly, and in a Figura-
tive, a Metaphorical Sence, and that only
to the Divine will, and called Satisfaction,
for no other Reason than, because God is
pleased freely to accept on't as such. Ruarus
there-

therefore having called Christ's Sufferings a *Wert*, a Price, Equipollent to what our Sins deserved, adds, *Not that it is so any otherwise than Ex clementi Dei Acceptatione*, that is to say, Christ's Sufferings are Satisfactory through God's Gracious Acceptation; not to his *Justice*, but *will*, which *Smalcianus*, in his Answer to *Smiglicius* his Preface to his Discourse about *Christ's Satisfaction*, doth thus explain. "We do acknowledge that Christ did satisfie in all those things imposed on him by God, for the procuring our Salvation, but Christ did not satisfie that Justice of God, which cannot suffer any Sin to go unpunished, and appease God's Anger, reconcile him unto us, by enduring those Punishments *in our Stead*, that were due unto us, and meriting Salvation for us.

Smal.Pref.
ad Smigl.de
Satisf.

Though there can be no Redemption without a full, and satisfying Price, and notwithstanding the Holy Scriptures speak much of *Redemption*, and of a Price, a full Price, and of Christ's Redeeming us by his Blood, as the Price; which Expressions can import nothing less than a proper *Satisfaction*; yet have they the Confidence to assert, not only that Christ's Redemption may be, but must be without *Satisfaction*; that such is the transcending Mercy of God in our Redemption, that it cannot be otherwise. "That the Righteousness of God exacting Satisfaction, in order to the Pardon of our Sins is not so much as to be mentioned, that there is no such Righteousness

Of the Growth of Error.

" in God ; That it's inconsistent with the
" Excellency of his Grace and Mercy. So
" *Smale. ubi sup.*

To put the best Colours they can upon this their odd Notion, they having granted that *Autēgr, Avīnūsegr, Price, and full Price*, doth signify a proper Price paid for the Redeeming a Slave out of Captivity, they averr that in the Holy Scriptures, it must be taken, otherwise, *viz. Improperly, and Metaphorically.*

Wolzogenius in his Commentary on *Mat-*
Chap. 20. 28. *thew*, interpreting these Words, [The Son of Man gave his Life a *Autēgr*, a Ransom for many] confesseth, " That *Απολύτων*,

Wolz. in " or *Autēgr*, Ransom doth properly signify *Mat. 20. 28.* " the Payment of a Price for a Captive,

" and a Liberation or Deliverance from his
" Captivity : However, it is taken, amongst
" Prophane writers, and almost every where
" in the Holy Scripture, *Metaphorically*,
" for a *Liberation*, without respect to the
" Payment of any Frice, — for it cannot
" (faith he) be proved, That Christ did
" make any Payment to the Justice of God,
" by his Death, for there is no such Ju-
" stice in God, as doth exact Vindictive
" Punishment for Sins.

Crellius, in his Answer to *Grotius*, de-
Erel. Re-
spōns. ad ner *Wolzogenius* doth ; and what both urge,
Grot. de Sa-
tisf. c. 6.
Socin. Pra-
tisf. Thosol.
e. 19.

As Redemption, which properly is the Paying a full Price for the Deliverance of a Slave, carries in it *Satisfaction*, and therefore

fore by the Enemies of Christ's Satisfaction, the Scriptures, which speak of Redemption without the least shadow of a Reason, are turn'd into Metaphors; so *Christ's Bearing our Sorrows*, though granted by them, meets with the same Treatment, For as *Smalcius*,

" We confess, that Christ did truly bear
" our Griefs, and Sorrows, but we deny it
" to be in that manner which *Smiglecius* af-
" firms it to be, namely, that Christ bore the
" Punishment of our Sins, for as in this man-
" ner, 'tis Impossible, Blasphemous, and Perni-
" cious; so there are other ways in which
" Christ may be said to bear our Sins, and
" they, such as are more conform to the
" Holy Scriptures, more worthy of God,
" and safe for Men; namely, That Christ
" suffered Death by Reason of our Sins,
" That he would never have suffered, if
" Man had not Sinned; and that he him-
" self bore our Sins, that is, abolished
" them, it being most certain, that the
" Word [Bearing] in Scripture, signifi-
" eth a Power to take away Further, —
" God exacted not any Punishment due ex
" *Justitia*, being an absolute Sovereign, & p. 300.
" who can, as he pleaseth, forgive the Sins
" committed against him; nor did Christ
" offer up himself to bear the Punishment
" of our Sins; nor if Christ had so offer'd up
" himself, might God accept it. For, if
" God had Punished the Innocent for the
" Noctent, he would have been not only
" Cruel, but Injust, and Unwise. And
within a few Pages after this, he insinuates,

Smalc. con-
tra Smiel.
de Satisf.
c. 6. p. 223.

Smalc. uxi
sup. p. 293.

as if the Doctrine of Satisfaction, as held by the Orthodox, makes God more *Cruel than any Tyrant*.

And whereas it is expressly asserted by the Holy Ghost, in 2 Cor. 5. and last Verse, That *Christ is made Sin*, to take off the Force of the Argument we draw from thence,

*Smalc. Re- Smalcius doth assert, "That to be made
fut. Smigl. "Sin cannot signifie a Sacrifice for Sin,
de satisf. c. "but Christ is said to be made Sin, because
q. p. 229: "he was dealt with by God, as if he had
"been a Sinner, from which 'twill not fol-
"low, that therefore Christ made Satis-
"faction for us, or endured the same Pu-
"nishment that was due to us. — We all
"acknowledge, that on him, who knew no
"Sin, the Punishment that was due unto
"Sinners, was inflicted, but not the same
"Punishment, nor what was Equivalent
"unto it, was, or could be laid on him—
"wherefore, what we have said concerning
"laying the Punishments due for our Sins
"on Christ: By Punishments we mean Af-
"fictions; which signifies no more than*

*Smalc. ubi sup. p. 226. before, when he desires it may be Remarked,
Slicht.*

Annot. in 2 Cor. 5.21. Crell. Re- spons. at Grot. de sa- That when they speak of Christ's being *Punished* for our Sins, they mean only that he was *Afflicted*. The same is affirmed both by *Slichtingius*, and *Crellius*.

*Apol. Pol. Righteousness. Apol. Equit. p. 13. for, faith the Polonian Knight, in his Apo-
logy, "The Scriptures makes no mention of
Przipeov. Cogit. in Lec. "the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness,
"but*

“ but simply of a Righteousness imputed unto
“ us by God through Christ, which is, when
“ God doth of his Grace and Mercy, raise
“ our Faith in Christ a living Faith, work-
“ ing by Love, so high, that by it we, who
“ are guilty of most gross Sins, may be e-
“ steemed Just, and Righteous, which is also
“ called the Righteousness of God; not ours,
“ because it’s given us freely, and not for
“ any Merit in us.

Now, as they do thus set the *Imputati-*
on of an Inherent Righteousness of our own
in the *stead of Christ*; so, notwithstanding
their many Pretences about ascribing Con-
version to the Power of the Spirit, they
mean nothing less.

Ruarus, in his Epistle to Peuschelius, Ruar.
doth very fully express the Socinian Sence. *ad Ioan.*
“ Conversion, which lyeth in a Reforma- *Peuschel.*
“ tion of the Understanding, approving *Epiſt. 9.*
“ the Gospel, and of the will, resolved to
“ Obey, or actually observing it, is caused
“ immediately, by that Conception, we
“ have in the Mind, concerning God, and
“ Christ, and the things appertaining to Re-
“ ligion, and by such Arguments as move
“ the Understanding to approve, and the
“ will to obey the Gospel. This Concep-
“ tion is begotten in the Mind, either by
“ hearing the Word Preached, or Reading
“ it; whence it is, that the word, whether
“ by Voice, or Writing expressed, is a kind
“ of Remote Cause of Conversion, yet such
“ as ought necessarily to go before, and if
“ diligently heard, or Read, is ordinarily

D 4 “ sufficient

"sufficient to begin it in all, excepting
"some dull Persons, whose *Minds* are
"too much under the influence of wicked
"Opinions; and *wills* distorted by a long
"custom in Sin. I say, that the *word* is
"sufficient to begin our Conversion, for,
"I do not deny, but *that after we have*
"rightly used our *Natural Faculties*, the
"Help of the Divine Spirit is given for the
"increasing the Strength is in us, to the
"compleating and finishing of our Conver-
"sion, which yet we could not know how
"to use, to so Holy an End, unless we
"had been first moved by God, and excited
"by his Word. Hence it doth appear, that
"it is God, who works in us both to *will*,
"and to *Do*; the *first*, when invited by a
"putting us in mind of the Gospel; the
"other, when by the moving of his Spirit,
"he strengthens us; yet so, that there is
"still Room left for the being excited to
"Virtue, by the Proposals of *Rewards*,
"and deterr'd from Vice, by the *threatning*
"of *Punishments*. To which I add, That
"if any will have it, that this *Knowledge*
"in our Mind, which *precedes* our *Afflent*,
"be rather a part of our Conversion, than
"a Cause, I will not contend with him,
"only then the *word* of God Preached, or
"Read, must not be esteemed the *Mediate*,
"but *Immediate Cause* of our Conversion.
Thus far *Ruarus*, who makes it very mani-
fest, that the *Socinian* Notion, touching
the *Power of the Spirit* to Convert, ly-
eth in ascribing the great turn from Dark-
ness

ness unto Light, and from the Power of Satan to God, unto the Hearing, or Reading of the word without any special Help of God's Spirit.

There being then so great a Difference between the *Orthodox Expressions*, used by the *Socinians*, and the corrupt Sense foisted in, under their Covert, we need not wonder at *Ruarus* his asserting, that the *Papists* amongst all other *Sects*, have most Reason to be kind unto the *Socinian*, for how Orthodox soever they would seem to be, they embrace the most corrupt and hurtful parts of the *Popish Religion*. I will clear this Assertion, by giving you *Ruarus* his own Words, which are amongst the Reasons given by him to show, why the *Papists* ought not to be so very angry with the *Unitarians*, whom they call *Socinians*, or *Arians*.

“Another Reason (faith he) is, because in the chief Articles of the *Christian Faith*, they agree with the Church of *Rome* more than any other Sect whatsoever, namely, in the *Doctrine of Predestination*, *Election*, and *Conditional Reprobation*, the Universality of God's Grace, and Fruits of Christ's Death, of free will, and its Interest in the Conversion of Man to the Faith; of Justification, which is made effectual by Charity, of the Necessity of Good works, which they urge more vehemently than any other Church, of the Possibility of keeping all God's Commands, of the Difference between the Old and New Testament, preferring the New before

" fore the Old, with respect to the Promises and Precepts, of the Difference between Venial, and deadly Sins.

It is also manifest, That how Orthodox soever *Przipcovius* would have his afflicted Innocence esteemed ; and, though he differs from *Socinus* about the *Divinity* of Christ, affirming him to be God, *truly*, in a *proper Sense*, and by *Nature* : Yet he is as far from the Truths he would be thought to embrace, as any of that Gang. For in that very place, where he opposes them, who ascribe to Jesus Christ *Divine Attributes*, and yet deny his *Divine Nature*, to expose the Ridiculousness of this Notion, he tells his Readers, that it's as *Alsfurd* as the Doctrine received by the Orthodox about *Distinction of Persons in the same Essence* : And, although he speaks of Christ's being God *truly*, in a *proper Sense*, yet denies him to be *Co-eternal*, and *Co-equal* with the Father, and makes him to be but a *Subordinate God*, not properly God, and Man at the same, but at distinct *Seasons*, first Man, then God : Nor doth he hold, that the Holy Ghost is a Person distinct from the Father, and is of the same Opinion with the *Socinians* about *Satisfaction*, giving the same Interpretation of those Texts that speak of [Christ's being made Sin] and [giving himself a full Price] that *wolzogenius*, *Crellius*, and *Slichtingius* have done before him, as may be seen in his *Cogitations on the New Testament*.

*Przipcov.
Hypera.p.
f. 4.*

What

What *Socinus*, and his Followers have herein done, it's very probable they learned from their chief Leader, *Bernhardinus Ochine*; who, Writing *more Academicorum*, did not only so *dereitfully* deliver his Sence, as to bring the Truth in doubt, but urges Arguments so closely in defence of Error, as to give it the Advantage.

Though *Sandius*, in his *Antitrinitarian Bibliothec*, accuses *Hoornbeck*, for mis-understanding *Zarnovecius*; and *Zarnovecius*, for misrepresenting Matters of Fact, when in the *Preface* of his *Answer to Socinus de Servatore*, he makes *Ochinus* to be his *Master*, from whom he had his Errors, *Sandius* is under the Mistake, and *Zarnovecius* in the right.

Zarnovecius, in his *Preface*, having in *Zarvov.* one Paragraph shown too great an Agree-
contra Soci-
ment between Socinus, the Jews, and Turks, *num de ser-*
doth in the next assure us, That Socinus vat. Pref.
had not his Blasphemies against the Son of God out of the Holy Scriptures, nor from the ancient consent of godly Men, professing the Orthodox Faith from the Apostle's Days to our Times, but out of the *Dialogues* of his *Country-Man*, and undoubt-edly his *Master Ochinus*, who had written at large thirty years before.

By [*Master*] *Zarnovecius* cannot well be supposed to mean any more than *One* from whom *Socinus* took his Notions, which is freely confessed by *Socinus* himself, in an *E-*
Socin. E-
pistle to Vadovita Professor at Cracovia, *pist. Vadov.*
where he is positive, "That as he never
Pub-

" Published any thing, but by the Importunity of others, so the very Notions complained of, had been long before propagated by others both in Poland, and elsewhere, particularly by *Ochinus*, as *Zarnovetus* had observ'd. For, really, that Opinion (*faith Socinus*) is clearly asserted, and inculcated in those *Dialogues*; and it is in short, this, That Christ did indeed, by his Blood wash away, and expiate our Sins, but in another Manner than that vulgarly received, viz. [That he, by pouring out his Blood, paid to Divine Justice, all that we, by reason of our Sins, were indebted to it; or, that he made Satisfaction for us, and our Sins] for neither was there any need of it, nor would God require the Punishment of our Sins from another, or transact our Debts on him, but freely forgive them. This Passage of *Socinus* doth at once clear *Zarnovetus* from *Sandius* his Charge, and prove *Ochinus* to be for the very Notions, *Socinus* most heartily espoused, which compared with the Profession *Ochinus* makes of the Orthodox Faith, and his manner of handling it, may convince an Unbiassed Mind, that he made the first Publication of those Errors in that deceitful way, since taken up by his *Socinian Followers*; for tho' *Socinus* himself asserts, That *Ochinus* openly delivered and inculcated the same Notion about Satisfaction he was charged with, yet *Ochinus* doth it by his Friend *Jacobus*, the other *Dialogist*, pretending an Answer to the

the Arguments he had urged, as if he had been a Zealous Afferter of the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction.

S E C T. IV.

*A Reflection on the deceitful Methods
of the Socinians.*

THESE few Instances are, I presume, sufficient to Evince, that the *Socinians* are not the *Fairest*, and *most Candid Adversaries*, nor ever can be justly ~~so esteeme~~med, except Deceit, double Dealing, and Hypocrisie be made the Ingredients of true Candor, and a generous handling of Controversies: For (as you have seen) their Method is first to make their Heresies look most like the Doctrines they oppose, and as soon as they find their ensnared Proselytes able to bear it; they take off their Mask, acknowledge the difference to be great, and then go on to treat the Doctrines, that just before they would be thought to be for (to use Dr. Edwards his Word) most * *scur-*
rilously, and with the greatest *Impudence*, insinuating, as if they had been the only Masters of Reason, and sincerest Professors of true Piety and Holiness.

They are so humble, and modest, that it's become impossible for them to forbear either the Despising others, or Applauding themselves. *Socinus* therefore could not but write a Treatise on purpose to prove, *That*

* See Dr.
Edward's
Preface to
his Preser-
vative a-
gainst Soci-
anism.

Socin. in it's the Duty of every good Man among the
Append. Reformed in Poland, to separate from them
 as from Persons too Impious to be Communicated with, and joyn themselves to the
 more Holy Assemblies of those, falsely and
 undeservedly (to use his own Words)
 called Arians, and Ebionites. He takes
 it for granted, that the Reformed were very
 Vicious and Debauch'd, and assigns the Rea-
 son partly to their *Doctrines*, and partly to
 their *Neglect of Discipline*: And glories in
 the Holiness of their own Assemblies, pre-
 tending, that such are their Principles, and
 such the Exactness of their Discipline, that
 it could not well be otherwise.

Slicht.
cont. Meis.
 p. 485.

ubi sup. p.
 488.

This Book of *Socinus* was answered by
Balthazar Meisner, a *Lutheran*, but de-
 fended by *Slichtingius*, who to expose the
 Reformed, enumerates many vile Practices,
 observed in common by them: And in Vin-
 dication of *Socinus*, and his *Followers*,
 makes no scruple to assert, That their *Glory-*
ing not being *Rash*, but well grounded, is
 no more than what the Apostle hath done be-
 fore them; nor did the *Pharisee* Sin in Pub-
 lishing his *Virtues*, but in Exalting himself,
 and Contemning others, when he should
 humbly have sought for the Pardon of his
 own *Sins*, a thing they endeavoured, even
 when they modestly mention the things done
 by their Assemblies, that were worthy of
 Praife.

But though they usurp to themselves this
 Title, viz. [Great Masters of Reason)
 they will not allow *Reason* the Privilege of
 being

being Competent enough to discover the plainest and most necessary Truth in the whole of our Religion ; namely, *That there is a God*, and in some of those very Instances, in which they ascribe most unto it, they oppose its clearest Maxims, which is most effectually done in their Essays, to destroy the *Divine Nature* of our Blessed Redeemer, where, struggling between plain Scripture, and their own Error ; to maintain the latter, which lyeth in their making him but a *Finite Creature*, and own what is the burthen of the former, that *Infinite Perfections belong unto him*, and he the proper Object of our highest Adoration and Worship, They contradict the clearest Reason as grossly as ever the Papists do, by making a *Finite Subject* the *Seat of Infinite Perfections*.

Of this, *Przipcovius* being aware, he roundly asserts, That Jesus Christ is truly God, in a *proper Sence*, and truly *Man*, but not at the same time ; when on Earth, he was properly *Man*, and after his Resurrection, and not till then *truly* and *properly* *God*. A Notion as gross as the former, a *true God in a proper Sence*, and *by Nature*, and yet a *God*, but Sixteen, or Seventeen Hundred Years ago.

Nor are they more happy in their *Morals*, for (beside their *Hypocrisie*) their denying all secret Assurances, and the certainty of God's fore-seeing all future Events, that depend upon the freedom of Man's Will, (as a very learned Person hath lately ob-

obſerved) muſt cut off the Exercise of many Devotions, and much weaken our Confidence in God, our Patience under all Misfortunes, and our Expectations of a Deliverance in due time. Further, their vacating and making void the Fourth Commandment, which is attended with a neglect of the *Lord's Day*, is an in-let into all manner of Vice, and the very Notions they frame of God to ſupport their other Errors, are ſuch as leſſen the Fear Men ought to have of God's Judgments. And as Dr. Edwards hath well obſerved. “ *Socinus*, by denying

Prefer. ^{a-} *gainſt So-* ^{b-} *ein. p. 42.* ^{c-} *43.* “ the Divinity and Satisfaction of Christ, “ hath plainly over-turn'd the Foundation, “ upon which the Christian Church, and “ Religion have been built, and by his other “ Methods hath given a ſhrew'd blow to all “ Religion whatſoever, whether *Natural*, “ or *Reveal'd*, to that an unwary Reader, “ by peruſing his Writings, may find him- “ ſelf an *Atheiſt*, before he well perceives “ how he comes to be ſo, as he faſh in ano- “ ther Cafè, viz. *His Opinion againſt Hell Torments*, that he had ſo contriv'd “ the Matter, *Ut lector prius sentiat Doctrinam iſtam ſibi jam peruafum eſſe quam ſuaderi animadverat.*

When I moſt impartially weigh these things, I mean, their deceitful Attempts to enſnare the Unwary to favour their Opinions, their Contemptuous Treatment of the Bleſſed Mysterieſ of the Gopſel, and its Advocates, together with their assuming to themſelves the Charaſter of being the moſt Rational

Rational Divines, and Men of Excelling Piety and Holiness, even when none do more contradict the plainest Maxims of Reason, and lay a surer Foundation for the utmost Immoralities: When I lay these things together, I am so far from thinking, as those great Men do, who represent them, to be the *fairest Adversaries*, that I rather incline at least to fear, that the Account given of them by the despised *Lubbertus*, which I will lay down in his own Words, is most true. "They are (saith he) Arrogant and Proud, who measure all things by vain Glory, and empty Names of Honour, when they see that those, who in other Disciplines invent some new Notions to be Commended, they think it will be Laudable in them to Innovate in Sacred Theology. And being unskill'd in true Divinity, they despair of gaining a Name by Explicating, or Defending the Orthodox Doctrine: But burning with a desire of Praise, they disturb every thing, that they may be Famous, and had rather be talk'd of for breaking of Churches, than grow old without Fame in the true and Orthodox Religion. When they perceive other Learned Men to be preferr'd before them, they are angry; and what is most base, they Dissemble and Counterfeit the Orthodox Religion, pretend to a Zeal for defending sound Doctrine; swear to our received Confessions and Catechisms, and lib. de Fe with their own Hands subscribe to what they swore; and yet, they with utmost cont. Socin Lubbert. Praef. ad Endeavours^{p. 2.}

" Endeavours oppose the Sound, and publickly embraced Doctrine, and craftily
 " instill a new and wicked One into their
 " Disciples, and carry about Calumnies
 " against the Orthodox.

Thus much touching the Methods used by *Foreign Socinians* to insinuate, and spread their Errors, I will in the next place show how exactly they are followed by the *Remonstrants*, and then acquaint the Reader with the Arts of our English *Socinians*.

S E C T. V.

The Arminians imitate the Socinians. They pretend an Agreement with the Orthodox.

TH E *Arminians*, to the end, they might with the greater Success insinuate their Errors, do also their utmost to cover them. Nothing therefore (they say) can be found amongst their Assertions, but what is conform to the Holy Scriptures, the *Heidelberg Catechism* established A. D. 1578. by a *Synod of Dort*, for the publick use of their Churches, the *Belgick*, and other *Reformed Confessions*.

Armin. Epist. ad Hypolitus & Collibus. Arminius, in his Epistle to *Hypolitus & Collibus*, protests, that he never, either in the Church, or University, taught any thing, but what was according to the Holy Scriptures, the *Belgick Confession*, and *Heidelberg Catechism*.

In

In a Letter to *Johannes Matthijsus*:
“ These things, which I have at this time
“ delivered, as they do agree with the Holy
“ Scriptures, so they are not contrary to our
“ *Confession*; and *Catechism*, for which rea-
“ son I do the more freely express my self.

In another to *Sebastian Egbert*. “ I do
“ publickly preach to a numerous Auditory,
“ and frequently dispute when my Reverend
“ Collegues are present, at which times I
“ have used the greatest freedom, in the An-
“ swers I have return'd to Objections : Be-
“ sides I have a private *College*, at which
“ thirty Students, or more attend ; and yet
“ never hath there been the least mention,
“ that I ever uttered any thing contrary to
“ the Holy Scriptures, or our Confessions,
“ and *Catechism*; although some of my
“ Collegues, whose Zeal is such for the Pu-
“ rity of Doctrine, that they would never
“ have been silent, had they whereof to ac-
“use me, have been instigated thereunto.
“ And whereas it's spread abroad, that I
“ direct my Pupils to Read the Writings of
“ the *Jesuits*, and *Coornhertius*, the slan-
“ der is so grofs, that I cannot find softer
“ Words to express it by, than to say, *It is*
“ *a down right Lye*, for I never advis'd so
“ much as one to any such thing. But this
“ indeed I do, after the Reading of the
“ Scriptures, which I do most earnestly press,
“ yea more than any other, as the whole A-
“ cademy can testifie, I do direct to the
“ reading of *Calvin's Commentaries*, which
“ I praise much more than *Helmichius* him-
self

" self ever did, as he hath confess'd. For I
 " do esteem them to excell all others so
 " much in the Interpretation of Scriptures,
 " that there are none to be compared with
 " them, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, that
 " there was a more excellent Spirit in him
 " than in any other : As for *Common Places*,
 " I Recommed his *Institutions* to be read af-
 " ter the *Catechism*, as containing the best
 " Explication of it. For the truth of this
 " I can bring a multitude of Witneses.

In a *Declaration* of his Sentiments made to the *States of Holland*, and *West-Frieze-land*, (wherein are the Reasons, why he declin'd to give any Answer to the Questions propos'd by *Lansbergius*, *Fraxinus*, and *Dolegius*, Deputies from the Synod of *South-Holland*, and by *Eogardus*, and *Rolandus*, Deputies from the Synod of *North-Holland*) his endeavour is to show an Agreement between his Notions in each of the controverted Articles, and the *Belgick Confession* and *Catechism*. I will give you what he saith touching the *Grace of God in Conversion*, and the *Justification of a Sinner in the sight of God*.

" What concerns the *Grace of God*, I
 " do, first of all, (saith he) believe it to
 " be that gracious and free Affection, where-
 " by God doth take pity on a miserable Sin-
 " ner, by which he doth, in the first place,
 " give his Son, that whoever believes in
 " him, may have Everlasting Life; then
 " doth he *justify* him, and give him the
 " Privilege of a Child by Adoption,

" a Right to Salvation. 2. *This Grace* is
" an diffusion of all the Gifts of the Holy
" Spirit, which are for the Regenerating,
" and renewing of the Understanding, as
" well as Will, and Affections, such as
" Faith, Hope, Charity, &c. without
" which Gifts of Grace no Man is able to
" Think, will, or Do any good thing.
" 3. It is the continued Assistance, and help
" of the Holy Spirit, according unto which
" the Holy Ghost does excite and stir up
" the Regenerate unto Good, by infusing in
" to them Spiritual and Heavenly Thoughts,
" inspiring them with good Desires, and en-
" abling them actually to Will that which
" is good ; yea more, according to this
" Grace, the Spirit doth Will, and work
" with the Man, that what he Wills, he
" may be enabled to Perfect. After this
" manner I ascribe unto Grace, the Begin-
" ning, Continuation, and Consummation
" of all Good, even so far, that a Regene-
" rate Man without this Preventing, Excit-
" ing, Continued, and Co-operating Grace,
" can never think, will, or do any good, nor
" resist the feeblest Temptation to Evil. How
" then can I be said to be injurious to the
" Grace of God, or attribute too much to free
" Will? The Controversie is not about the A-
" ctions, or Operations ascribed to Grace ; I
" am for as much as any Man whatsoever ; but
" it is only about the Mode, or Manner of
" its Oprations, whether it be by an Irre-
" sistible Force, or not? Here, indeed, I
" do with the Holy Scriptures, hold, that

Of the Growth of Error.

“ many resist the Holy Ghost, and reject the
“ offer’d Grace.

And in his Letter to *Hypolitus à Collibus*, “ Concerning Grace, and free Will,
“ according to the *Scriptures*, and consent
“ of the Orthodox, I do declare, That *Free
will* without Grace, can neither begin,
“ nor perfect any true Spiritual good Work,
“ and least any think I do (as *Pelagius* did)
“ play with the Word, [Grace] I mean
“ that Grace, which is the Grace of Christ,
“ and belongs to Regeneration; which I
“ hold to be simply, and absolutely neces-
“ sary for the inlighnting the Understanding,
“ regulating the Affections, and inclining
“ the Will to what is good, that infuses
“ saving Light into the Mind, inspires
“ the Affections with Holy Desires, and
“ boweth down the Will to act according
“ to that saving Light, and these good
“ Desires. This Grace, Prevents, Be-
“ gins, Accompanies, and Follows; It
“ stirreth up, helps, and works, that we
“ may Will; and that we may not Will in
“ vain, Co-operates with us. It secures us
“ from Temptations, Assists, and helps us
“ against them, upholding us against the
“ Flesh, the World, and the Devil. In
“ the Conflict it gives us the Victory, and
“ if at any time, we are overcome, and fall
“ in the Temptation, this Grace recovers
“ us, establishes and gives new Strength,
“ making us more watchful. It begins the
“ Work of Salvation, promotes, perfects,
“ and consummates it. The mind of a

“ Carnal

" Carnal Man, is, I confess, dark'ned,
" his Affection's vile and inordinate, his Will
" disorderly; yea, he is *dead in Sin*, and
" that Preacher is most highly esteemed by
" me, who attributes *most* to *Grace*, if so
" be, that, whilst he is extolling Grace, he
" doth neither impeach God's *Justice*, nor
" take from Man *Free Will* to what is *E-*
" *vil*. What any Man can desire more, I
know not.

About the *Justification* of a Man in the ^{Jacob. Ar-}
sight of God. " I am not sensible (faith _{min. Decla,}
" he) that I either teach, or hold any thing _{sentent. p.}
" but what is *Unanimously* received by the ^{127.}

" Reformed Protestant Churches, and most
" exactly agrees with their Sense. There
" hath been, I know, a Controversie in this
" particular, between *Piscator*, and the
" French Churches, as whether the Obedi-
" ence, or Righteousness of Christ, which
" is imputed to Believers, and in which
" their Righteousness before God doth con-
" sist, be only Christ's Passive Obedience, as
" Piscator affirmed? Or whether it be also
" his Active, which all his Life he rendred
" to the Law of God, and that Holines,
" in which he was conceiv'd, as the *Gallic*
" Churches hold. But I never interested my
" self in it.

And how oddly soever, he expressed him-
self in this place, he would still be thought
a good *Calvinist*. " For (faith he) what- _{Armin. De-}
" ever I have in this Point delivered, *I da. ubi sup.*
" differ not so much from Calvin, but that
" I am ready with my own Hand to sub-

" Scribe what he hath on this Subject, in
" the third Book of his Institutes.

Armin. Di-
spat. Thes.
48. Sect. 5. In his *Disputations*, he is more particular,
speaking distinctly of the several *Causes of Justification*: Of the *Meritorious*, and
Material, thus:

" That Christ, by his Obedience, and
" Righteousness, is the *Meritorious Cause*
" of Justification, who may therefore be de-
" servedly called the *Procatartick Cause*.
" The same, Christ in his Obedience and
" Righteousness is also the *Material Cause*
" of our Justification, that is, as God gives
" to us Christ for Righteousness, and im-
" putes his Obedience and Righteousness un-
" to us; in respect to this double Cause,
" namely, the *Meritorious*, and *Material*,
" we are said to be constituted Just, or
" Righteous, by Christ's Obedience.

In this place *Arminius* (you see) doth distinguish between the *Meritorious*, and *Material Cause of Justification*, the One being Extrinsick, belonging to the *Efficient*; the other Intrinsick, or made the *Matter* of our Justification. The first is *Christ*, by his Obedience; the other is *Christ for Righteousness*; *Christ Given*, and his Righteousness Imputed. He was too Learned to confound the *Material*, and *Intrinsick* with the *Meritorious*, which is an External, and *Efficient Cause*, asserting, that as *Christ* is the *Meritorious Cause*, so he, as an *Efficient*, justifieth us by his Righteousness: As he is the *Material*, he is given by God for Righteousness, and his Righteousness is imputed to us for Justification. His

His Thoughts touching the *Instrumental, Formal Cause*, he expresses in these Words. " Faith is the *Instrumental Cause*, " or Action, by which we apprehend Christ, " and his Righteousness offered unto us by " God, according to the Order and Pro- " mise of the Gospel ; where it is said, " That *whoever Believes shall be Justified* " and *Saved*. The *Form of Justification* is " the gracious Estimation of God, whereby he " imputes the Righteousness of Christ unto " us, and imputes Faith for Righteousness ; " that is, God doth forgive unto us who " believe our Sins, for the sake of Christ ap- " prehended by Faith, and esteems us as " Righteous in him, which Estimation hath " annexed unto it the Adoption of Sons, " and a Collation of Right to the Inheri- " tance of Eternal Life.

And among the *Corollaries* deduced from what he had asserted in his Disputation, he is positive, " That it is impossible for *Faith*, " and *works to Concurr to Justification* ; " that Christ did not Merit, that we be ju- " stified by the Dignity and Merit of Faith, " much less that we be justified by the Merit " of Works. But the Merit of Christ is " opposed to Justification by *works*, and " *Faith* opposed to *Merit*.

These Appeals to the *Catechism*, and *Confession*, and the consent of the *Reformed Protestants*, his recommending *Calvin's Commentaries*, and *Institutes* to his Pupils; and these, and such other *Passages*, make it clear, That *Arminius* would fain be thought

*Armin. ubi
sup. Sect. 7,
8.*

an

an *Orthodox Calvinist*; which was also the desire and endeavour of his endeared Companions, and Followers, even of *Vytenborgart*, *Borrius*, *Poppius*, *Grievenchovius*, *Arnoldus*, *Corvinus*, and *Episcopius*, at their Conference, A. D. 1611. with *Ruardus*, *Plancius*, *Becius*, *Fraxinus*, *Bogardus*, and *Festus Homnius* at the Hague, where 'twas their care in each of the Five Articles, to show an Agreement between themselves and the *Heidelberg Catechism*, the *Belgick* and other *Reformed Confessions*.

There is so much to this purpose in *Bertius* his *Scripta Adversaria Collationis Hagienensis*, that the mention of a very small part thereof would fill up more Room than I can spare for this purpose; besides, this very Method hath been taken by some later *Arminians*. *Curcellaeus*, to clear himself from the Charge of Heresie, doth in the Doctrine of Justification, protest, "That " he doth not think any Man is justified in " the sight of God, for the *Merit* or Dignity of his Works: But only through " the mere Grace, which is in Christ's Blood, " do we obtain the Remission of Sin, we amending our Ways, not walking according to the Flesh, but according to the Spirit, *Rom. 8. 13.*

When its objected, that his making Repentance necessary to Justification, which includes good Works, destroys its being freely of Grace, he Answers, " Not that " Repentance, or our Works do *Merit* any " thing from God; or are so perfect, as " that,

Curcel. Dis-
sert. 4. de
Justifica-

Sect. 7.

Curcel. ubi
Sup. Sect. 14

" that, if God should strictly search into
" them, they could stand before him in
" Judgment. God forbid, that I should
" assert any such thing; but this I say, they
" are necessary, because God will not make us
" partakers of the Salvation, purchased by
" Christ's Blood, by *any other Rule or Con-*
" *dition.* And that he may the more plau-
sibly insinuate into the Minds of his Readers,
his Orthodoxy in this Matter, he tells us,
" That they who hold Repentance, and
" Conversion to be required in order to Par-
" don, as the greatest part of *Protestants*,
" he thinks at this time do, cannot contra-
" dict this Doctrine: For (saith he) Remission
" of Sins and Justification are with them e-
" quipollent, which may be safely enough
" asserted; For, though they may be as
" things divers separated from each other;
" yet God according to the Tenor of the
" Gospel-Covenant, forgives no Man's Sins,
" but at the same time *eſteems him Righte-*
" *ous*, and promises to give him the Reward
" of Righteousness, which is Eternal Life,
" which is also carried in the full Pardon of
" all our Sins: For, seeing our Sins must be
" reduced to these two Heads, namely, *Sins*
" *of Commission*, and of *Omission*, He, *Curcel. ubi*
" whose Sins of both sorts are pardon'd, *sup. Sect. 9;*
" must be consider'd as *perfectly Righteous*,
" and therefore worthy of the Reward.

S E C T. VI.

The Difference between the Arminians, and the Orthodox.

BUT what Care soever *Arminius*, and his Partakers, heretofore, and the more wary and fearful have since taken to cover the dangerous Notions they are for, and appear as like the *Orthodox*, as may be; yet, unless they would abandon all Essays to propagate their *Dogmata*, 'twas impossible for them, when most cautious, perfectly to conceal either their Notions, or Designs.

*Epist. Vyt
zenbog. p.
55.* Twas therefore a vexatious Affliction to *Arminius*, (as he oft told *Vytzenbogardus*) that he could not meet with Men of Learning, to whom he might freely impart his Sentiments.

*Epist. Vyt
zenbog. p.
121.* "This one thing I greatly bewail, and lament, (faith he) that there is no one I can venture to converse with.

The Reason he assigns for this his Complaint, was the prevailing Humour, then amongst the Orthodox, to call every thing Heresie, which they approv'd not, even when they themselves either neglected close Study, or were destitute of that Learning, which was necessary to search into those deep Mysteries, whereby *Arminius*, whose Learning and Abilities were too great to be contin'd within the old narrow Circle of solid Divinity, where Men of as much Learning, and deeper Judgment delighted to abide, breaks out,

*See his E-
pistle to Vy-
zenbogard.*

p. 57.

out, and makes Inquiries into the profound and unscrutable things of God, where he was bewildred, and soon lost himself.

Had he been as gently treated by all, as he was by that profound Scholar, *Franciscus Arminius's Junius*, he might have escaped the Snare, but this great Man soon dying after *Arminius* had freely opened himself unto him, and others, being severe in their Condemning his Inquiries, he had none to Confer with, but *Vytenbogard*, and *Adrian Borrius*; Men whose Inclinations too much suited his own to be a Balance to him in his Indagations. By these Men *Arminius* is confirmed in the Errors his own Mind disposed him unto, and were then thrown in his way by the *Socinians*, who had furbish'd up several *Pelagian Heresies* about Predestination, Original Sin, and Free Will, which about this time, on the burning the Writings of *Ostrodius*, and *Voidovius*, were as an Introduction to *Socinianism*, craftily insinuated by *Theodore Kemp*, *Koornhert* and others.

Arminius, being thus provok'd by the angry Passions of some, entic'd by the Flatteries of others, and undoubtedly instigated too much by his own Spirit, is fixedly set against the *Calvinian Doctrines*, which he labours to Undermine, even when he professed the most Zeal for them. For, altho' in pursuance of *Vytenbogardus's* earnest Request, *Arminius* was very careful (as he also pur'd him he would be) to mention nothing Dissonant from the *Heidelberg Catechism*,

and

*Armin. E-
pist. Vyten-
bog. p. 213.*

Armin. E- and Belgick Confession, and boldly under-
pist. *Vyten.* took to defend all he wrote by them, yet
bog. p. 213 twas only, that thereby he might the more
effectually ensnare his Scholars to a Clo-
sure with his unsound Principles; for twas
his labour to get a review of the *Catechism*
and *Confession*, in order to a substantial
Change or total Remove.

Ep. Armin.
Vytenb. p.
202.

In a *Declaration of his Judgment*, made
unto the *States of Holland*, and *West-Frieland*, he ventures to offer his Reasons for
the *Review* of both; which being promi-
sed by a late *Synod of South Holland*, he
was emboldened to do. Some of his Rea-
sons are, " that it might appear to all, they
" leaned chiefly on the word of God, in mat-
" ters Religious, that the *Cathechism* and
" *Confession* being written by Men who are
" *Falible*, might contain in them some
" one Error or other; and it was not at all
" unmeet for a *National Synod* to enquire
" whether they did agree in every part
" with the word of God; even for the
" words, and manner of speaking, as well
" as touching their real Sence? Whether
" there be not somewhat in them made neces-
" sary to Salvation, which is not in Truth
" so? whether there be not some *words*
" and *Forms* of speech used, which may be
" diversly understood, and so give too much
" occasion to strifes and contentions! whether
" there be not some things in them repug-
" nant to each other? many other enquires
he made, which sufficiently shew, that *Armi-*
nius could not heartily close with all he had
subscrib-

subscribed unto, and therefore as he rejoyc'd
at the news of a (a) review, so nothing was (a) Epift.
more grievous to him than to here of a fre-
quent repeating their Subscriptions, which p. 212.
he compares to the Spanish and Trent Inqui- p. 213.
sition. ubi sup. p.
123.

In his *Apology*, and *Answer* to the one
and thirty *Articles*, said to contain the O-
pinions of himself and *Adrian Borrius*; he
gives a particular account, how he was by
his Friend *betraied* in too free a discovery of
his dissatisfaction with the *Catechism* and
Confession: For (faith he) "about two
" Months agoe, a certain Minister would
" fain know, why I was for a submitting
" the *Catechism* and *Confession* to the Ex-
" amination of a National Synod? to whom
" I freely replyed; that my fense of the
" thing was included in this Syllogism, viz.
" Every Humane Writing, not ^{Autoritas} *Avtemson*,
" not of Divine Inspiration, and conse-
" quently, what might contain in it Error,
" may, yea must be examin'd, when it may
" lawfully, and orderly be done in a Synod,
" to which such Examinations belong:
" But such are the *Cathechism* and *Confession*;
therefore, to prove his Assumption,
he gave a particular instance out of the *Ca-*
techitism, which instance, as he too justly
complains, was soon in every bodies
mouth. But tho' *Arminius* his Friend
did ill to betray him, yet it's hereby mani-
fest, that notwithstanding his pretensions
to an agreement with the *Catechism* and
Confession, he did really Dissent from them.

The

The next step made, to show a *Dissatisfaction*, was by them, who were to prepare matters for the Synod, at which time they proposed, that untill the Examination was over, and all things settled, *there might be no more Subscriptions imposed; and that the Obligation might be taken off from them, who had already subscribed.*

This *Proposal*, was no sooner made by *Arminius* and *Vytenbogard*, but the *Calvinists* are alarm'd, and think on nothing less than that the design is to make a Change in the Doctrines of Faith: Several Letters are therefore written unto the Learned in divers Countries, particularly by *Lubbertus* unto Dr. *Melvin* at St. *Andrews* in *Scotland*, a Copy of which is within a year transmitted out of *England* unto *Arminius* and *Vytenbogard*, who sent a defence of themselves to *Melvin*, showing how they were abused by *Lubbertus*, however, *Fid. Prae-*
stant et II- confels they were for a freeing the Subscrib-
tusfr. viror. ers from their Subscriptions, untill all was
Epist. 23°. finished about it in a National Synod:
**43.* *which, they say, was with a Caution, that*
during this time there should be no disput-
ing, nor Preaching on the Controverted
points.

A Recognition, or Review was press'd again^y by the Remonstrants at the *Hague Conference*, with a desire, that they might be freed frm their Subscriptions, till the Review was over. In the National Synod of *Dort*, they also urge it, boldly declaring, that, by the Fundamentals of the Reformation

tion, and the constitution of our Churches, no one ought to be censured meerly because he taught any Doctrine, contrary to the Confession, so long as it was not contrary to the word of God ; for a Confession was not the infallible rule of every Doctrine. *Script. Hist.* *Remon-*
strant p. 20. *Ubi sup. 41.*

And one of the conditions, proposed by them to be observed by the *Synod*, was this, That in examining the matters in Controversie, the enquiry be not only whether they agree or not agree with the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, as may be supposed to be in their Confessions ; but that in the first place, and above all things they consider, whether they agree with the word of God, and that with respect to the necessity, as well as Truth of every Article : For which reason, let every one be, by solemn Oath, bound to promise, that he will not in judging respect Confessions, Catechisms, or any other Humane Writings, but only the word of God, &c. And that, touching the Review of the Confession, and Catechism, every one have liberty to offer his Considerations on them, without any danger of incurring a Censure.

Who ever will consider, how vehemently they press for a *Review* ; how earnest they were for the Examining every point in Controversie, without a respect to the Confession, or Catechism, tho' they were never made the Rule of Faith ; and how eagerly they sought a Freedom from their Subscriptions, and from a Censure in case they objected against any thing in them, and will also

carefully peruse their considerations, against both ; where, amongst *Seven and Thirty* Articles in the Confession, he will meet with at least *Thirty*, and in the Catechism where are about a hundred and *Thirty* Questions and Answers, he will find above *Threescore* to fall under their sharp reflections : And that in opposition to the Canons of the *Dort Synod*, they did publish a Confession of their own. Whoever will, I say, put all these things together, and compare the *Catechism*, and *Brigick Confession* with the Remonstrants *Declaration*, cannot but be abundantly satisfied, that, nor *Arminius*, nor the *Remonstrants*, his Followers, were sincere in their Protestations and Subscriptions, but very corrupt and deceitful, and whilst they pretended to approve of the Confession and Catechism, they esteemed many things in both Difsonant from the word of God.

Thus much is not only the Language of these endeavours, but ingeniously granted *Relton* & by *Utenbogard*, who, in h.s answer to *Fetenhog*. *ad fatus Homnius his Specimen*, professes himself *Specim.Hem.* to be one of them who thought it necessary, p. 6. who desired and pray'd, that there might be a *Review* of their Publick Confession, and an examining of it by the *word of God*, for this *very end*, that what he, or others thought was not so agreeable with the word of God, might be proposed to the common consideration of the several Churches. And *Episcopius*, in his reply to *Fetus Homnius his Specimen*, tho he falls very severely upon *Homnius*, for bringing him i nas an Af-
fester

fester of what he positively denied, yet yields, that in the five Articles, they differ'd from the Belgick Confession. His words are, " That, excepting the five Articles, all that *Episcopius* is charged with, are either about Matters frivolous, next to nothing, or such as differ not from the Confession.

*Opt. Fid.
Fest. Homm.
p. 2.*

Arnoldus Poelenburg, in his Letter to *Hartsooker*, opens himself in this matter more freely. " He is not alham'd, nor afraid to revive the memory of *Coornherti*-
" us (for whom *Arminius* would not be
" thought to have any respect) and *Cornelius Wiggerus*, as opposers of the Catechism, and Confession, lamenting a want or near that
of success in the many attempts made against them by divers other Persons, not only *Arminians*, but by some, who were their most violent opposers, such as *Piscator*, and the like.

*Vid. Poe-
lebd. Hart-
sook. p. 222.*

*Cornelius Wiggerus. A.
D. 1597.*

time, oppof-

ed the Con-

fession and

Catechism,

as a Lesbi-

an Rule,

Besides, it cannot be denied, but that the *Arminian* Doctrines are too manifestly a Contradiction to the *Heydelberg Catechism*, and *Belgick Confession*, to admit of a Conciliation with them : How zealous ever *Arminius* was to be taken for a *Calvinist*, none more eagerly endeavoured to subvert the very foundations of the Doctrines embraced, explained and defended by *Calvin*. There is so much craft, and yet open contradiction to be found in his, as well as in his Followers Writings, that I see no reason to doubt of the Truth of those things related of him and them in the Preface to the Acts

*that might
be turn'd to
either side.*

*He was sus-
pended, set*

up Conven-

ticles and

stiffly ad-

heres to his

peculiar no-

tions. Vid.

Epist. Cor.

*Wig. p. 35,
&c.*

Pref. ad E- of the *Synod of Dort*, where it is affirm'd,
def. p. 3. that *Corvinus* ingenuously confessed in a cer-
tain Writing in *Dutch*, that *Arminius* de-
fended many things against his own Judg-
ment; that *Gomarus* humbled him by pro-
Pug. 10. ducing a Paper of his own Writing, in
which he had asserted, That the Righteous-
ness of Christ is not imputed for Righteous-
ness in the Justification of Man in the
sight of God, but *Faith it self*, or the *no
credere*: The very *Act* is by God's gracious
Acceptation that Righteousness of ours,
whereby we are justified before God. What
Gomarus here asserts to the silencing of *Ar-
minius*, is no more than what he himself
Pleaded for in his answer to the one and
thirty Articles, and may at any time be seen
in some of his other Writings.

S E C T. VII.

They separate from the Calvinists.

But their separating from the *Appro-
vers of the Heydelberg Catechism*,
Belgick Confession, and *Acts of the Synod
of Dort*, even when they communicated
with the *Menonists*, and *Socinians*, is an
uncontrollable Evidence of their renouncing
the *Calvinian Doctrines*, and of the favour-
able Opinion they have of the *Mennonisti-
cal and Socinian Heresies*.

*Epiji pag.
628.* In their Letter to *Madame de la Hague*,
they give several reasons for their *Separ-
ation*, which I take to be the effect of much
de-

deliberation and advice for *Conradus Verstius*, in his Letter to *Stephen De Ryeger*, to whom (having blam'd him for want of *Courage* to appear on behalf of the *Remonstrants* Cause, which the *Lutherans* universally, and more moderate *Papists* approved,) he imparts their purpose of entering a *Protestation* against the *Synod*, and of *separating openly* from the *Contra-Remonstrants*: A matter not yet ripe enough to be divulged, which yet he had communicated to *Huberus*.

In a Letter of an *Anonymous* to *Episcopius*, it is reported from an old Acquaintance of *Episcopius*, that the *Remonstrants* did ill to abandon Communion with the Reformed, and at the same time list *Socinians* amongst their Brethren, to whom *Anonymous*, as himself assures us, made no other answer than this; He "knew not that there was any such intimacy between the *Remonstrants*, and *Socinians*, but the reason of the separation was because the Reformed express'd no greater dislike of *Manichæism*, and were so much for *Persecution*.

Poelenburg, tho' he brings in many odious Charges against the *Contra-Remonstrants*, yet one Principal Argument for their *Separation* is grounded on their Dissent from the Doctrines contain'd in the *Heidelberg Catechism*, and *Belgick Confession*, which he thinks they must be thought to approve, if they joyn with them in the Sacrament of Baptism, and the Lords Supper. "What shall I think of them (faith *Poelenburg*)

Catech. Heydelb. Quest. 65. & 66. “ who hold Communion with the *Contra-Remonstrants*, who offer either themselves, or Infants to be Baptized by them, and joyn with the Prayers at Baptism ; for seeing, as the *Heydelberg Catechism* will have it, the Sacraments are Seals of their Faith, how can ours, (ours I take them to be, who in judgment and heart are with us, tho' bodily present with the Adversary) How, I say, can ours desire the *Sealing*, and *Confirmation* of that *Doctrine* they can by no means approve ? And seeing in the Celebration of the Communion, we declare an Unity in Faith, and mutual Charity, how can we profess to hold Communion in that *Doctrine*, we are perswaded is altogether false ? Doth not the Apostle command us to abstain from all appearances of Evil ? Is it not a vile thing to profess to believe that to be true, which we do really judge is false ? Is it not a thing most abominable to turn the Blessed Sacrament which the Lord hath made the Bond of Love, and mutual Fellowship, into a Banner of Schism, and Division ?

So far *Poelenburg*, who hath many other Arguments against Communicating with the *Contra-Remonstrants*, in his *Epistolary Disquisition*, whether the Remonstrants may lawfully joyn themselves to the Assemblies of the *Contra Remonstrants* ? But this little I have out of him, being sufficient to show that their separation is an impregnable evidence of their rejecting

the

the *Doctrines* contain'd in the *Heydelberg Catechism* and *Confession*; I will go on to give an impartial account of the Charitable Opinion they have of the *Heresies* of *Socinians*, and the *Mennonists*; which will farther evince, how far they were from a Closure with the *Calvinian Doctrines*, even when they would be thought sincere in their Subscriptions to them.

S E C T. VIII.

Their good Opinion of the Socinians and Conjunctio with the Mennonists.

Festus Homnius, just before the Synod of Dort met, sends forth a Specimen of the Belgick Controversies, and in it shewing, how far in some Momentous Points of Christian Faith, the Remonstrants differ'd from the Belgick Confession, doth in several instances make it manifest, that they agree with the *Socinians*, particularly in denying the Simplicity, Unchangeableness, Infinity and Praefcience of God, that no knowledge is to be had of God but by Divine Revelation, thereby destroying all natural Religion; that the Doctrine of the Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, is not only contrary to common sense, but plainly

opposite to Divine Testimonies : In these and several other particulars the Agreement between the *Arminians* and *Socinians* may be gather'd from what *Festus* hath taken out of their own Writers ; such as *Vorstius*, *Welingius*, *Episcopius*, and *Arminius* himself.

The Synod of *Dort*, soon meeting after this *Specimen* was published, a complaint is brought against it to the *Synod*; however, the *Synod* confirming the opposed Catechism, and Confession, and strictly enjoining subscription to them, and their own Acts ; the *Remonstrants* compose and emit a Confession of their own, which the Learned *Bodecherus*. A. D. 1624. very diligently examines, and comparing it with the *Racovian* Catechism, the Writings of *Faustus Socinus*, *Smalcarius*, *Osthorodius*, and many others of that Party, doth in many instances, with much clearness show a Parallel between the *Socinians* and *Remonstrants* to be so exact as to move the Reader to conclude, that the *Confession* of the one was taken out of the *Writings* of the other.

Polyander, *Rivet*, *Walaeus*, and *Thysius*, Professors at *Leyden*, do not only prefix their Approbation to *Bodecherus*, but within two Years after, they censure the *Remonstrants* Confession, wherein they are very positive, that under the pretence of *Censur. Praef. Peace*, they would introduce *Socinianism*. *Prope finem*. Thus much is in the close of their *Censure* of the Preface, and in several places of the Book it self, which they do so closely urge,

urge, that the *Remonstrants* in their *Examens* are forc'd to be more free in their Acknowledgements than their open Designs would otherwise have admitted.

Tis true, *Episcopius*, in his answer to *Homnius*, and in his *Rodecherus Ineptiens*, would fain clear himself, and his Partners from this Charge, and to do them right, (for I would not willingly misrepresent them) I must confess, that in an instance, or two the Report made of *Episcopius* was not so well grounded as might be wished. For *Homnius* in his *Specimen Quotes Episcopius* for denying, that we can attain unto the knowledge of God by the Light of Nature, which is a Notion advanced by *Socinus*; *Episcop. dist. put. privat de Cognit. Dei. Corol. 2. Vid. Fest. Homn. Spec. Controvers. Art. 3:* that *Festus* might fasten this imputation on *Episcopius*, he refers his Reader to his private Disputations about the knowledge of God, where the question is, whether the knowledge of God be Natural? To which *Episcopius* is said to answer by a distinction thus. "We distinguish whether the knowledge of God, which is attained unto by Nature, be Natural? and holds it in the Negative. This very passage, is several years after the Synod of *Dort*, repeated by *Peltius*.

To this *Episcopius* doth satirically enough reply, charging *Homnius* for being a *Falsarius*, who not only perverted his sense, but changed his very words, putting into his corollary, [*Naturalis*] instead of [*Salutaris*.] This charge, (if true) being so very high, I could not satisfie my self

self till I had examin'd the Place, to which *Hominius* doth refer, and whatever was in the *Manuscript*, in the Print I found it thus, viz. in the close of *Episcopius* his *Disputation* about the *knowledge of God*, there are three Corollaries, the second and third, being in these words.

2. *An Cognitio Dei sit Naturalis?*
3. *An Cognitio Dei, quæ ex Natura habetur, Salutaris sit? N.*

This third Corollary, supposing the knowledge of God to be *Natural*, cannot without a too severe Reflection on *Episcopius* his understanding, be taken as *Hominius* hath Represented it; for, as it's thus, the question must be, whether the knowledge of God *had from Nature*, be *Natural*? whereby as the question is it self an absurdity, so the denial carries in it a contradiction, as gross as that Light is not Light; that what is from Nature is not *Natural*, can signifie no less than that what is *Natural* is not *Natural*. But to hold that the knowledge of God, which is from Nature is not *saving*, is a truth aptly enough express'd, and what the Remonstrants profess to be for, as I hope on another occasion more fully to observe.

However, the *Matter of Fact*, concerning the *Remonstrants* disposition towards the *Socinians*, is too manifest to admit of doubt, and there is much more said by *Hominius*, *Bodecherus*, *Peltius*, *Vedelius*, and many others, about their Agreement in Principles, than hath been fully answer'd either

either by *Grotius*, *Episcopius*, or any other that I have met with.

Besides, the Applauses given the Remonstrants by the *Socinians*: and the numbring them amongst the supporters of their *Dogma-ta*; with the Remonstrants declining to condemn them; the Reasons why they do so; their setting them in a higher Class than the *Calvinists*; and maintaining Communion with them amongst the Mennonists, sets it above all Dispute.

Vorstius, tho' a celebrated *Remonstrant*, yet in good earnest a *Socinian*, as may be inferr'd from what *Smalcias*, a great defender of *Socinus* in an Epistle, represents him to be, namely, a most useful Man, for whom many Prayers were sent to Heaven by their Churches in *Poland*. It's true, *Sandius* was a while in doubt, whether he should place this *Vorstius* among the *Antitrinitarian* Writers; but, when he considered how much he valued the Writings of the *Sarmatian Unitarians*, that he was the Author of the *Compendium Socinianismi* answer'd by *Cloppenburg*, and supposed to have been written by *Oistorodius* and *Voidovius*, that the *Lublinse Synod*, did in the Year 1600, call him to the Government of one of their Schools, and had seen a Confession of his Faith composed by him on his Dying Bed, where he spake more freely of God and Jesus Christ. When *Sandius*, had weighed these things, he doth with utmost <sup>3rd. Bill
10th. An-</sup> _{ti-trin. pag.} assurance give him a place in the *Antitrini- 98, 99.
tarian Bibliotac*, as he also doth his Son
william

William Henry Vorstius, Pastor of a Church among the Remonstrants ; and *Curcellaeus* who succeeded *Episcopius* in the Professors Chair at *Amsterdam*.

Furthermore, I add out of *Bogermanus* his Notes, on the defence of *Vorstius*, and *Pref. Lib. de Autoritate Scripturae*. the Remonstrants, made by *Grotius*, that *Vorstius* his zeal for *Socinianism*, remarkably appear'd in his publishing *Socinus* his Discourse concerning the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, which he recommended to the Reader as solid, nervous, profitable, and almost necessary for those times, tho' 'twas really full of *Socinianism*, and esteem'd by that Party as an introduction to their Religion.

What therefore hath been urg'd by *Grotius*, *Episcopius* or others, in defence of *Vorstius*, or by *Vorstius*, himself to throw off the charge of *Socinianism*, doth serve only to convince us of the Hypocrisie of the Man, and that according to the fears of some of his *Socinian Friends*, he had got so much of the *Serpentine Craft*, as to have lost the *Innocency of the Dove*.

What less than this can be the Import of *Vorstius's* recommending a Book, in which *Socinus* had laid the Foundation of his Heretical Superstructure as nervous, profitable, and necessary ; and yet in a Letter to *David Pareus*, declares that he condemned the Errors of *Socinus* about the Person and Office of Christ, of Faith, Justification, and the like, and whatever smelt of *Socinianism* ?

But this *deceitful* method they learned of *Ochinus*

Ochinus, who sometime before *Faustus Socinus* wrote any thing, vended the very Errors, that are now called *Socinianism*, who, as I have already observed, whilst he brought many Arguments against the Truth, would be thought an embracer of it.

And as *Vorstius*, *Father* and *Son*, with *Curcellaeus*, are set in the *Anti-trinitarian Vid. Dedi Bibliothec*, so *Arminius* himself, as *Peltius* out of *Paræus* avers, is received by the *Socinians* as theirs. His words are “*Paræus* Socin. in an Epistle dated the first of *March 1613*. writes thus, “the *Socinians* in *Poland* have “expressly named your *Arminius*, as their “own, together with *Bonfinius*, and *Acontius*, their secret Followers, by whose Au-“thority they demanded Admittance to the “Communion of the Orthodox, but ‘twas “Resolutely denied them.

And as the *Socinians* Reckoned the *Remonstrants* amongst their Worthies, even such as *Arminius* himself Applauding them for supporting their *Dogmata*; in like manner, tho the *Socinians* deny the Deity of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit; as also the satisfaction of our Redeemer, the *Remonstrants*, in return to their *Socinian* Brethren, will by no means allow them to be *Hereticks*.

Episcopius, tho in his *Eodecherus Inpi-tiens*, his *answers* to *Hornius*, and his *Apology*, oft strenuously endeavour'd to clear himself, and *Remonstrants*, from the charge of *Socinianism*; yet, in his answer to the *Specimen of Calumnies*, and elsewhere, is bold

*Episcop.
Resp. ad
specim. Ca-
lumad Ca-
zel.*

bold enough to own that he cann't condemn them as guilty of Heresie. " The reason (faith he) why we are not fully perswaded that the *Socinians* are to be condemned for Hereticks are these. 1. Because it's certain, that in the Holy Scriptures, neither expresly, nor by manifest Consequence, was any *Anathema* denounced against such as err'd only as the *Socinians* do. 2. That they seem to have some weighty Reasons for their Error, securing them from a *Pertinacious* adherence thereto, and consequently from the Fault of Heresie. " The Reasons that seem to favour them are, 1. Many places in Holy Writ at first view appear to be for them. 2. That what is urged against them from the Holy Scriptures, Councils or Writings of the Orthodox, are either so confounded by the variety of Interpretations, given by the Orthodox themselves, or feebly prest; or, so as to be accommodated to *Socian* Errors. 3. They who write against them, freely yield, that the *Socinian* Notions are more conform to Humane Reason than their own. 4. That in every age from the first rise of Christian Churches, they mention Christians not a few, even Doctors, and Bishops, Eminent for Learning, and Holines of Life, that have thought and spoke differently of this matter. — And many wholly ignorant of the Eternal Generation of the Son of God from the Father, even most of the Fathers before the *Nicene Council*, such

such as *Irenaeus, Justin, Tertullian, O-*
“ reign, and many others. 6. Because there
“ have arisen incredible Dissentions, Inex-
“ plicable Questions, Innumerable Contro-
“ versies, not only about the Doctrine it self,
“ but the terms and words used to explain
“ it, which after utmost endeavours they
“ could never understand. 7. Because, out
“ of *Justin*, the most ancient Writer, who
“ lived next the Apostles times, a Martyr
“ for the Truths of Christ, they have rea-
“ son to believe, that the most Primitive
“ Church held Communion with them,
“ who profess'd to believe that Christ was
“ but *Yahs d̄sp̄w̄r̄* a meer Man, begot-
“ ten only of Man, and made Christ by E-
“ lection.

These are some of the Reasons adduced by *Episcopius* (but learnedly answered by Dr. *Bull*) for Vindicating their refusal to condemn the *Socinians*, as Hereticks; in which, abating the words, [*Error*,] given the *Socinian*, [and *Orthodox*] given to their Adversaries, he insinuates as if the *Socinians* had the better of it in the Controversie. What the *Orthodox* offer to explain their Sense, is said to be with so much obscurity and Confusion, that it's not easie to be understood; they are divided amongst themselves, and give different Interpretations of Texts; are loose in their Arguing, and do oft in their opposition fall in with their Adversaries; whilst on the other hand, the *Socinians* have the Holy Scriptures in their first appearances, and the most reason,

son, the Orthodox themselves being Judges and all the Fathers till the Council of Nice, for them, all which is about the very Doctrines, wherein the *Socinians* differ from the Orthodox.

But touching the Points, wherein the *Socinians* fall in with the *Orthodox*, the *Calvinists* are not to be compared with them.

Episcop. Bo-decher. I. nus, and let the whole World, if they nepti. p 65. "We cannot (faith *Episcopius*) forbear giving in our Testimony on behalf of *Socinians*, and let the whole World, if they please, consider it, He disputes most closely, giving the Adversary scope enough, granting whatever may be without prejudice to *Truth* and his Cause. Where he is to press hard upon him, there he fastens his Foot, and with much Pungency brings home his Arguments to the Conscience; he will rather urge plain Scripture, than insist on other *Hypotheses*, and brings Reasons without prejudice, and not argue after the manner in the *Calvinian* Schools, nor hide himself in Clouds of Sophistry, nor seek Evasions, but hasten to the Merits of the Cause. So far *Episcopius*, whose farther endeavour is contemptuously to expose the *Calvinists*, having just before boldly asserted, that the *Socinians* do really agree with the *Orthodox* touching the substance of these following Doctrines. viz. "The Authority, Perfection, Perspicuity, the Reading, and Interpretation, of the Holy Scriptures; the Nature, Properties, and Actions of God; the Creation of Men and Angels; Providence

dence and Predestination, the Precepts, Promises, Lords Prayer, Discipline, Church, &c. In all these things (faith *Episcopismus*) as to what belongs to their substance, *Socinus* agreeth with the *Orthodox*. And about these very points lyeth the *Vitals* of *Socinianism*, even their denying the necessity of the Old Testament, their confirming the whole of Christian Religion to the New, as if Christ had never been foretold, Präfigur'd, or Promised in the Old. The Scripture's so perspicuous, that we may attain to the saving knowledge of them without the help of the Holy Spirit. That there is but one Person in the *Nature of God*. That God is not Immense, Omnipotent, Omniscient, as in the Holy Scriptures 'tis declared and asserted. That Man was not created in Knowledge, and Righteousness, that the Image of God on Man lyeth only in having Rational Faculties and Dominion over the Creatures. That in his first make he was Mortal, and should have dyed tho' he had never sinned. That future *Contingents* cannot be known by God himself. That on the admitting the Infallible Präscience of all things Future, there could be no notwithstanding the *Calvinian Doctrine* of Prädestination. That the Precepts given *Adam* were adjusted to the Infant state of Mankind, and were *imperfect*; that Jesus Christ gave new, and more perfect Laws. That he enlarged the Obligation of some of the Moral Laws, abolished others, and added three new Moral Precepts to the

Old given by *Moses*. That the Promises of the Old Testament were only of Temporal Blessings; and that Men under it, were not sav'd as we are under the New, by Faith in the Messiah.

Whatever *Episcopius* means by the *Socinians Agreement* with the *Orthodox*, these are the Doctrines of *Socinus*, and his Followers, most opposite unto, and inconsistent with what is held by the *Orthodox*, and cannot be found, and true, in the Judgment of *Episcopius* himself, unless he himself be a *Socinian*. And sure I am, that whatever they suggest to the contrary, about their being in suspence, and doubt in this Particular, they look on the *Socinians* to be good Christians, as appears further, by their holding Communion in Acts of Religious Worship, with them amongst the *Mennists*.

What I have taken out of these *Arminian* Writers doth, as any one may easily perceive, make it clear, that it hath been their, as well as the *Socinian* Method, by the use of *Orthodox Phrases*, and *Subscriptions* to found *Catechisms*, and *Confessions* of Faith, to hide, for a while, their erroneous Opinions; and when they have gain'd a Reputation with the People then to open themselves, and appear above board, slyly insinuating a *New*, and *wrong Sense* on *Orthodox Terms*, and *Phrases*.

To clear this, I will only observe, That, as they will have the *Term*, [*Instrument*] when spoken of Faith in Justification, to signify the same with [*Condition*] whereby there

there is a great Turn made in Controversie, as the Arminians Improve it; so they impose on the Phrases, [Vice nostra, Loco nostro] a Sense, most contrary to their ancient, and constant Meaning.

It's well known, that *Socinus*, *Crellius*, and their nearest Followers, did concur with the Orthodox about what was the Genuine Imports of those Phrases ; holding, that they signified a *Proper Surrogation*, where one is put into the *Place*, *State*, or *Condition* of another ; sustaining his Person, and one with him, *In conspectu fori*. *Sabrogatum sapit naturam ejus in cuius Locum Sabrogatur.*

These Phrases, taken in this Sense, the Socinians stoutly opposed, loading the Orthodox, with all the horrid Consequences which flow only from an Assertion, that Christ did take on him the Condition of the Sinner, in every little Circumstance, or Accident: But my Lord Bishop of Worcester hath cleared the Maxim of *Surrogation* from the least Pretence of such a Charge, by distinguishing *Inter Naturam Primordialem*; & *Accidentalem*, and proving, that *Sarrogatum sapit tantum naturam Primordialem, non Accidentalem.*

That in this Sense, the *Orthodox* Universally understand these Phrases, [*Vice nostra, Loco nostro*] is so manifest, that, whoever is acquainted with their Writings, can't but acknowledge it : And it's no less Evident from the Scriptures, That 'Am [for] when it's said, *Christ Suffered*, [for us]

signifieth a *Proper Surrogation*, which is *Essential unto Satisfaction*, made to Punitive, or Vindictive Justice. However, there are a set of Men, of the *Arminian* Tang, who will have it, That [*Vice nostra*, or *Loco nostro*] signific no more than [*nostro bono*] that when it's said, Christ dyed in *our stead*, the meaning is, Christ dyed to *befriend us*; and only, that the *Blessed Effects* of his Death might be made ours.

Another expreileth it thus: "If Christ
"dyed for our *Benefit*, so as some way or
"other by Virtue of his Death and Suffer-
"ings, to save us from the Wrath of God;
"this, for ought he knows, is *All*, that
"any body means, by his dying in our
"stead.

By such Practices, as these, it is, that many are unawares ensnared into divers Pernicious, and hurtful Errors: First, to the entertaining corrupt Apprehensions about Christ's Satisfaction, and then to a down-right denial of it; whence it is apparent, that the *Arminian* Errors lead the way to the *Socinian*, as the *Socinian* do to the Abomination of the *Deist*.

Thus much may suffice, touching the *Methods*, taken by Forreign *Socinians*, and the *Arminians*, to instill, and propagate their *Doctrines*. I will go on, in the next place, to consider what *Arts* are used by our English *Socinians*, to spread their *Heresies*.

C H A P. IV.

Some of the Various Methods, taken by the English Socinians, to Insinuate, and spread their Errors, Detected.

S E C T. I.

The English Socinians can't agree in any one Particular Formula of Faith, or Catechism : Sundry Differences amongst themselves in Matters of Importance : Their Unanimity in taring up the Foundations, and commonly received Systems of Divinity.

IT being the Expectation of our English Socinians, that, if we attack the Doctrine of their Books ; or describe their Opinions, we do it out of their own Writings, not from the Books of Foreigners, I will confine my self, in the Account I give of them, to their own Prints.

First then, it must be observed, That the English Socinians have not made such Advances in their *New Divinity*, as to be able to give a distinct Idea of what it is they do Believe.

Confid. on
the explic.
of the Trin.
p. 32.

The Reason is Obvious : To Invent, ~~Institute~~ a *New Religion*, which they, who Reject the Old must do, if they will have any, is not Easy : Nor is there a Man, amongst them, Great enough to Prescribe to the Party : And the Fondness, Hereticks have for their own Particular Notions, is such, as will not suffer them to Part with any thing of their *Own*, for the sake of a *Scheme*, or *System* of another's Composure.

Though Mr. *Biddle* did some Years ago Emit a *Confession*, (Reprinted 1691.) and a *Catechisme*; yet I cannot find that the English *Socinians* do Adhere thereunto, any more than the Followers of *Socinus* beyond the Sea's have done to the *Racovian Catechisme*, which, as My Lord of Worcester Observes, was so far from Pleasing all, that the *New Editions* were with some, Important Alterations. And, whoever will Consult what hath been Written, by our Gentlemen, since 1690, will see, that they Pretend not to give a Particular *Summary* of the Positive Parts of their Religion.

Tis true, they Generally Profess a Zeal for the *Apostles Creed*, One of 'em tells us,

Some Thoughts upon Dr. Stel. Vindic. p. 48.

“ That he Resolves his *System* into the *Creed of the Universal Church*, which by Reason of it's *Antiquity*, but especially of the *Authority* of its *Doctrines*, is Rightly called the *Apostles Creed*, and Admitted of all Christians, notwithstanding their Implacable Hatreds, and Divisions. Thus, they Confining themselves

elves to Generals, give us in the Daik, about the Particular articles of their *Faith*; besides, their Pretences about the ANTIQUITY of this *Creed*, are, as hath been Unanswerably Proved by the Learned *Jaffins*, most Weak and without the least Shadow of Reason, and their Sense of it, if in favour of their Anti-Trinitarianism, Contrary to that, Received in the Churches, ever since its first Composure; whereby, we are as much at a loss, touching the System of their *Faith*, as if they had said nothing at all of it.

We will therefore Look into the *Brief Letter* ^{1.} *Hystory of thet Unitarians*, as they call p. 3. themselves, and see, what they say there.

"Sir, In Answer to Yours, Demanding a
"Brief Account of the *Unitarians*, called
"also *Socinians*; also their *Doctrine* con-
cerning *GOD* (in which only they differ
from other Christians; the *Remonstrants*
PROFESSEDLY Agreeing with them
in other Points of *Faith* and *Doctrine*)
and the Defence they usually make of
their *Heresie*. They Affirm, **GOD**
IS ONLY ONE PERSON, not
THREE. They make our Lord *Christ*
to be the *Messenger*, *Minister*, *Servant*,
and *Creature* of **GOD**; They Confess,
He is also the *Son of GOD*, because He
was Begotten on *Blessed Mary*, by the
Spirit, or *Power* of **GOD**, *Luke*
I. 35. But they Deny, that *He*, or any
other Person but the Father is **GOD AL-**
mighty, and **Eternal**. The *Holy Ghost*, or

" *Spirit*, according to them, is the Power
" and Inspiration of GOD, *Luke 1. 35.*

Tho', we might Reasonably Expect a very *Particular*, and Exact Account, in this *History*, of what they hold; yet, they stick in *Generals*, Referring Us to the *Remonstrants*, for a Catalogue of all, besides their Renouncing the Blest Loctrine of the *Trinity*; so that we are still where we were before we saw this *History*: For, as the *Remonstrants* do not PROFESSEDLY Agree with them in the other Points of Doctrine, They in like manner send us to the *Calvinists* with an Assurance, we shall find a great Part of *Socinianism* in their Writings.

Cap. 8.

Episcopius, I Presume, doth, in the Opinion of these *Gentlemen*, Understand what the *Remonstrants* held, as well as any man; who, notwithstanding the High Thoughts He had of the *Socinians*, doth positively Aver, that there is a most Exact Agreement betwixt them and the *Calvinists*.
 " Having, (saith he, in his *Eodecherus In-*
 " *epitians*,) sufficiently Cleared the *Remon-*
 " *strants*; from the Calumny of being *Soci-*
 " *nian*, I will Retort upon them, and shew;
 " that, with much more Appearance of Ar-
 " gument, we can fasten on the *Contra-Re-*
 " *monstrants* the Charge of *Socinianism*,
 " even in those Points, which are Proper and
 " Peculiar to *Socinus*, and are Deservedly
 " called *Socinian*.

This *Episcopius*, tho', probably enough, touching the *Trinity*, an *Arian*; and in other

other Points a *Professed Remonstrant*, will yet by no means Allow a PROFESSED Agreement between the *Remonstrants* and *Socinians*. How then can we Hope to find in *Their writings*, a *Formula or Summary of Socinian Doctrines*? That there is too great an Alliance between the *Remonstrants* and the *Socinians*; that the Doctrines of the Former are too near akin to what are held by the Latter, and Preparatory unto them, I have cleared: But, that in ALL other Chap. 3. Sect. 6. &c. Points, excepting the *Trinity*, the *Remonstrants* PROFESSEDLY Agree with the *Socinians*, is too Notorious a Mistake, for the *Socinian Historian*, to Impose upon us.

However, they go on to Assure us, they sincerely Believe^x "That GOD is truly Omniscent; That he Foreseeth all Events, how Contingent soever they may be to us. But are they all of this mind? No; Others of 'em Ask; which is more Dishonourable to God, to be the Author of all sin. of Christianity and Wickedness that ever was, or ever will be in the world, or to Deny his Fore-knowledge of the Certainty of that, which is not Certain?

2. "They Believe the Real Omnipresence of God; That He is Present in his Essence, or Person in all Places: And not only by his Power, Knowledge, or Ministers. There are others of them, who Deny such an Immensity of God, which makes him to be ESSENTIALLY, and wholly in every Point of Space; because such

" IMMENSITY would take away all Di-
 " stinction between God, and the Creature :
 " And, [as the *Examiner* of Edwards af-
 " firms] has indeed an **ATHEISTICAL**
 " **TANG**, for the greater part of *Atheists*,
 " hold the Universe to be God. Another
 " of 'em faith ; " To Know whether there is
 " an Immensity of ESSENCE, or Opera-
 " tion, these are *Metaphyficks* out of my
Some Tho.
upon Dr. S.
Vindic. p.
14.
 " Reach, and are no Helps to the Setling
 " my Confidence, and Trust in God. There-
 " fore it is, that *Revelation* doth not speak
 " Precisely of this.

These Passages, do not only show how much our *English Socinians* Differ from each other in matters of most Importance ; But some of them, as well as *Forreign Socinians*, Deny God's *Omniscience* and *Immensity*. One can't be, some of 'em suggest, without making God the *Author of Sin* : And the other hath an *Atheistical Tang*. Why then are they so Angry with the Learned Dr. *Edwards*, for charging them with the Denial of those Essential Perfections of the Divine Nature ? Tis also affirmed by the *English Socinians*.

Biddies
Confes. of
Faith. p.
21, 22.
 3. That the *Holy Ghost* is a *Person*.
 " How could the *Holy Spirit* search all
 " things, even the Depths of God ? 1 Cor.
 " 2. How make Intercession for the Saints,
 " with Groans Unutterable ? Rom. 8.
 " How could He say to the Christians at
 " Antioch, Separate me Barnabas and Saul
 " for the work, whereunto I have Called
 " them, Acts 13. 2.— If these things,
 and

“ and sundry more, which may be alledged
“ out of Scripture, do not Evince the *Holy*
“ *Spirit* to be a *Person*, what can?

In Opposition hereninto they say, That *Brief Hist.*
“ *Rom. 8.*—God’s *Spirit*, or *Inspiration* *Sect. 1. p.*
“ being *Designed* to be a continual *Director*,
“ and *Guide* to the *Faithful*, is spoken of
“ in these and some other *Texts*, as a *Per-*
“ *son*, by the same *Figure* of speech, that
“ *Charity* is *Described* as a *Person*, &c.
The *Holy Spirit*, you see, is and is not a
Person with them.

4. “ They *Generally*, not only *Grant*, *Brief Hist.*
“ but *Earnestly Contend* that Christ is to *Sect. 3.*
“ be *Worshipped*, and *Prayed to*, because *p. 38.*
“ God hath, say they, by his *Inhabiting*
“ *word*, or *Power*, given to the Lord *Christ*
“ a *Faculty* of *Knowing all things*; and an
“ *Ability* to Relieve all our *Wants*.

In Opposition hereunto ‘tis said, “ There *Ansf. to Milb. p. 50.*
“ are no *Acts* of *Worship* ever *Requir’d* to
“ to be *Paid* to *Christ*, but such as may be
“ *Paid* to a *Civil Power*; to a *Person* in
“ *High Dignity* and *Office*, or to *Prophets*,
“ or *Holy Men*; or to such as are actually
“ *Possess’d* of the *Heavenly Beatitudes*.

They are, I confess, so *Ingenuous* as to *Answer to Milb. p. 49.*
Acknowledge, That the *Question* about the
Invocation of *Christ* has very much *Divided*
them, and if I take ‘em Right, the *English*
Socinians generally fall in with the *Notions*
of *Franciscus Davidis*, and *Christianus*
Frances, in Opposition to *George Blandra-*
ta, and *Faustus Socinus*, who were follow-
ed by the *Forreign Unitarians*, as they call
them.

themselves, and notwithstanding the specious Pretences to Liberty of Conscience, *Brief Hist.* *Let. 4 p.48.* which they Reckon the Peculiar Principle of the *Socinians*, and *Remonstrants*, the prevailing Party severely Persecuted their Brethren. They in *Transylvania* would not suffer any to come into any Places in the Ministry, unless they obliged themselves under their Hands, not to speak against Worshiping *Jesus Christ*. They in *Poland*, more Rigid, *Excommunicating* and *Deposing* from the Ministry, such as held, *Christ might not be worshiped with Divine Worship*.

This Persecution had some what of Extraordinaty Cruelty in it, as it was against men, who differ'd so very little from them. For the Persecutors did not affirm, that they were always Bound to Invoke, and Worship *Christ*, but that it might Lawfully be done. *Nos non teneri Invocare Christum*; *sed tantum jure omnino Posse*, saith *Socinus* again and again: Ay so often, that he thought himself Obliged, in a *Præmonition* to what he Wrote against *Franciscus Davidis*, to Explain himself, which he did briefly by declaring, that there were *Two Cases*, in which to omit the Worshiping of *Christ* is a Sin. The first, when they joyn with them in Worship, who call on the Name of *Christ*; The second, when the Spirit doth move them to do it; not to call on *Christ* in these *Two Cases* is a Sin.

Theſe

These few Intimations make it Plain, that altho' they give us no *Formula*, nor *Catechism* in which we may find a particular Account of what it is they Believe, yet in those few things they Profess to Own, they can't Agree about the Nature of Cod, whether Omniscent and Immense? About the Holy Ghost, whether a Person, or not. About the Invocation of Jesus Christ, whether a Duty or not? So that from any thing hath been Published by 'em, we can't be sure that any two of them are of the same Religion.

Howbeit, altho' they can't Agree what Religion to be of; they are most *Unanimous* in Determining what to be against, it being their Master-piece to Quarrel with our Confessions, and Catechisms, Destroy our *Systems*, and Tare up old Foundations. One faith, He can't find any Satisfaction, or *Consistency* in any of our *Systems*. Another Complains, that there is no *Catechism*, yet Extant, (that he could ever see, or hear of) from whence he could Learn the *True Grounds of Christian Religion*, as the *Bid. Catechism*. same is Delivered in the *Holy Scriptures*. The Examiner of Mr. *Edward's* Exceptions runs higher, Declaring, that the *Ob-scurity, Numerousness and Difficulty of Under-standing Systematical Fundamentals Promotes Deism*, and Subverts the Christian Faith. These are some of their ways.

Pref. to
Read. of
Christian.
Pref. to
Bid. Cate-
chism.

SECT. II.

The English Socinians do studiously Endeavour to Conceal the Religion, They are of.

That they may make it the more Difficult for us, to Know what it is, they are for, they Hide themselves under the Comprehensive Name of *Unitarians*, and *Anti-Trinitarians*, whereby they Reserve to themselves the Liberty of setting up, either for *Arians*, *Photinians*, *Jews*, *Mahometans*, or *Deists*, who Call themselves *Unitarians*; nor will they, when hard Put to it, Undertake the Defence of any One; no, not of *Socinus* himself, altho' they hold what is Peculiar to men of his Spirit.

Some Tho.

p. 4.

p. 18.

*Answer to Dr. Wallis
Four Letters. p. 16.*

Tho', they say, " That Jesus Christ was " the Son of God, only in a sense of *Consecration* and of *Mission*; and consequent- " ly, that his Unity with the Father, is not " an *Essential*, and *Natural Unity*, but a " meer *Moral*, and *Relative Unity*, which " consisting in the Equality of *Works*, not " of *Essence*, which is *Absolutely Incommuni- nicable*. &c. When this is *Socinianism* all over, yet, are they not *Socinians*, any more than they are *Papists*, *Lutherans*, or *Calvinists*. " They do not Profess to Fol- " low *Socinus*, but the *Scripture*. If *Soci-* " *nus* has at any time spoken *Erroneously*; " or *Unadvisedly*; or *Hyperbolically*, 'tis not

"not *Socinus*, who is their Master, but *Christ*.

When they Pretend to tell us, what they are, it's so *Mysteriously*, that no one can tell what to make of 'em. "They are Christians, *some The-*
"they thank God, they Side with Truth, p. 18.
"and take Shelter in the Bosom of *that Ca-*
"tholick Church, which stands *Independently*
"upon any thing, that goeth under the
"Name of a *Party*. But, where shall we find such a Church? Not among *Ebionites*,
Nazarenes, *Mineans*, *Alogi*, *Arians* or *Soci-*
nians; All these go under the Name of *Par-*
ties. Wherefore, seeing they Renounce the
Fundamentals of Christianity as Embraced by us, they must be Acknowledged to wrap themselves up in some *Mystery*; Or, to have no Catholick Church to Shelter themselves in.

To Compleat the *Mystery*, "They are upon Dr. S's Terms, heartily of the *Com-*
"munion of the *Church of England*, but *In-*
"dependently upon any *Faction* whatsoever. It's like we have *Anti-Trinitarians* as well as *Trinitarians* in the Communion of the *Church of England*, which is not more Possible, nor less *Mysterious*, than that the Denyal of the Trinity should signify the Affirmation, and Belief of it. However, giving them this, 'twill unavoidably follow, that two Distinct Parties, as contrary to each other as Light and Darkness, do constitute the Church. And such of us as want their *Sagacity*, are Tempted to conclude, that so long as they are against the *Doctrine of the*

the *Trinity*, they are *Anti-Trinitarians*; And, if they think, we are a *Faction*, we know them to be so: If therefore, they are not of the *Orthodox Party*, except they believe with *Teague*, that my *Lord Duke* is neither Dead, nor Alive, they must be of the *Anti-Trinitarian Faction*, and yet be heartily of the *Communion of the Church*, *Independently* upon any *Faction* whatsoever. That is to say, they are of a *Communion* made up of but two Parties, *vid. Trinitarian*, and *Anti-Trinitarian*, without being in *Communion* either with the One, or the Other.

But, do we what we can, seeing they Profess to Relieve, there is but *One Person Only* in the *God-Head*, they must be, we count, *Anti-Trinitarians*; and the Belief of the *Trinity* being essential to our Christianity, as Christianity is to Church *Communion*, 'tis as impossible for any One to be of the *Communion of the Church*, whilst an avowed *Anti-Trinitarian*, as it is to be a Christian without the Essentials of Christianity. We can't therefore Comprehend, *How* these Men can be of the Churches *Communion*: If they have a Distinction to solve this Difficulty, it must be a *monstrous Mysterious One*, Whether *Intelligible*, or *Contradictious*, let them Judge. Touching their Sincerity in the using these Methods I will not concern my self, knowing that however it be, it's clear, that their Design is to *Conceal* their Religion, which, I confess, is their wiser Course, seeing it is *such*, as can't bear the Brightness and Glory of the Light.

SECT.

S E C T. III.

The English Socinians judge more Charitably of the Salvation of Jews, and Turks, than of Orthodox Christians, whom they make to be as Bad as Egyptian, and Roman Pagans.

WHEN I first made Enquiry after the Reason, why these Gentlemen declined a Defence of the Foreign *Socinians*, and Refused to be Described from their Books, I was of Opinion, they thought themselves Unable for so great an Undertaking; But on a more close Examination, I am convinced, that *this* is not the *Only Reason*: there is another, namely this, They can't Extend their Charity so far towards us, as *Foreign Socinians* have done.

How ill soever, I have Proved the Foreign *Socinians* to be, it must still be Acknowledged, that not only in Learning, but in Temper they greatly Excel the *English*. And tho' they look'd upon the Orthodox to have Err'd from the Truth, yet esteemed them not to be either Idolaters, or Heretics, or out of the Way to Salvation.

Ruarus, in an Epistle to *Mersennus*, Ruarus E-
dith clear us from the guilt of Idolatry,<sup>pist. 56. p.
260.</sup> tho' we Worship the Divinity of *Christ*,
as *Eternal*, which he esteem's an Error;

H

For,

Of the Growth of Error.

For, saith he, "Who is there of our own
 " way, that dares arrogate to himself so
 " perfect a Knowledge of the Divine Na-
 " ture, that another more sharp and acute
 " than himself may not Convince him, that
 " in some respects he had Framed a *False*
 " Idea of God?

Socinus, in his second Answer to *Tolanus*,
 Partic. 59. enters his Protestation against the making
 us *Hereticks*: His words are, "Altho' I
 " hold, that *Christ* before he was Born of
 " *Mary*, had no Existence; yet do I Con-
 " fess him to be *God*, even to be *True God*,
 " in Opposition to a *False*, and *Imaginary*
 " *God*: And altho' I Deny *Christ* to be
 " that *Cod*, who Created the Heavens and
 " the Earth, yet do I not make them to be
 " *Hereticks*, who Affirm him to be so. If
 " we take the word [*Heretick*] in the most
 " common Acceptation, for one who is with-
 " out the Pale of the *Church* (in which
 " Sense, it's manifest that *Tolanus* himself
 " uses the Word in this Place) that they
 " do greatly Err, I firmly Believe. But,
 " I do not therefore Exclude them from
 " the Fellowship of the *Saints*, so long as
 " in other Respects, they Persevere in the
 " Right Way to Salvation, approving them-
 " selves Obedient unto *Christ*.

Nor were they so Fond of the *Mahome-
 tan Religion*, as not to think it a Reproach
 to be numbered amongst its Favourers. This
 is sufficiently Cleared by *Ruarus*; For,
 whereas *Beza*, in an Epistle to *Peter Sta-
 torius*, mentions *Valentilis Gentilis* his
 Accu-

Accusing *Paulus Alciatus* for turning *Turk*,
Abraham Calovius no sooner mentions this
Story, in a Letter to *Ruarus*, but *Ruarus*,
as one who Abhor'd the *Mahometan Re-*
ligion, doth what he can to Vindicate *Al-*
carius from so Vile a Calumny : " Most
" Worthy Sir, (faith he to *Calovius*) For
" give me that I attempt to Free you from
" a Mistake in a Point of History. It is
" about what is Reported of *Paulus Alcia-*
" *tus*, and *Nusenus*, closing with the *Tur-*
" *kish Religion*, as if they had abandon'd
" Christianity, and had taken up with the
" *Alcoran*. I am apt to think, *Beza*, in
" one of his Epistles, lead you into this
" Mistake, when he mentions what *Gentilis*
" accused him of before the Magistrates of
" *Bern*. But this might be done by *Genti-*
" *lis*, only to Ingratiate himself with the
" Magistrates, especially seeing he knew,
" *Alciatus* did acknowledge only the Father
" of *Jesus Christ* to be the most High God ;
" And he himself, after a sort making a
" Profession of Three Gods, might be the
" more easily Induced to load him with the
" reproachful Charge of *Turcism* —
" But whatever *Gentilis* imagined, you
" know very well that *Alciatus* did for ma-
" ny Years in this City lead a Pious Life
" according to the Christian Rules, and
" when he dyed, he commended his Soul
" to *Christ*, the *Saviour*. Thus much
" hath been Attest'd by many and some now
" Living, &c.

Epist. 47.
p. 225, 226.

But tho' *Socinus* and *Ruarus*, were so kind as to clear us from the Guilt of *Idolatry* and *Heresie*, Reckoning us to be Members of that Church, in which Salvation may be had; yet so much Candor must not be look'd for from the English *Socinians*. For,

*Exhort. to
Free Enqu.
p. 3.*

*Notes on
Athanas. p.
32.*

They esteem us so *Byassed* against their Religion by Prejudices and the like, that we use not a reasonable Diligence to obtain the Knowledge of what they call Truth, and therefore we are told, "That "as to the *Jews* and *Turks*, who Believe, "and Worship the One True God, and "him only, perhaps *they are in a Nearer Proximity to Salvation*, than such as "against sufficient Opportunities of a right "Information, and for Worldly Interests, "have *Apostatized* from the *Christian Faith* to the *Athanasian*.

*Resolut.con-
cerning the
Trinity and
Incarnat. p.
18, 19.*

Thus they make us *Apostates* from *Christianity*, further off from Salvation than *Jews* or *Turks*. And that we may see what Charity they have for the *Mahometans*, and their Religion, they add, "Divers Histo- "rians will have it, that *Mahomet* meant "not, his Religion should be esteemed a "New Religion, but only the *Restitution* "of the true Intent of the *Christian Reli- gion*. They affirm moreover, that the "Mahometan Learned Men, call them- "selves the True Disciples of the *Messias* "or *Christ*, intimating thereby that *Chris- tians* are *Apostates* from the most Effen- "tial Parts of the Doctrine of the *Messiah*.

This

This Plea, our English Socinians make for Mahomet and his Religion (Representing the Turkish Impostures to be a more Refined Christianity than that Embraced by the Orthodox) brings to my Remembrance an Old Prophecy of Simler, which on the Reviving of the Errors of Servetus, by Lælius, Socinus, Blandrata, and others, he wrote Anno 1568. A part of it is to this Purpose. "When Matters Religious are "in Agitation, I would not willingly Im- "mix with them what are of a Civil Na- "ture; nor would I rashly Forebode Evil "to any Man: However, if we may make "a Judgment of things Future, by what "hath heretofore feln out, I am afraid this "Doctrine [viz. of the Socinians] will pre- "pare the way for Mahometanism, and "Portend Ruin to those Flourishing "Countries, in which it is sown, &c. The whole Prophecy is in the Close of that Historical Preface, which Cloppenburgh hath set before his Confutation of the Compendium Socinianismi, supposed by him, to have been Written by Ostrodius, and Voldius; but, as Sandius hath it; by Conradus Vorstius. To return.

The Malignity of these English Socinians runs higher, they can't content themselves to throw us into a worse state than the Turks are in, Placing us in the next Rank to them. But to vent their Spight, they make our very Religion, as bad as the Impostures, and Dotages of the Egyptian, and Roman Pagans.

Touching the Mystery of the Trinity,
 they say, " There is no Parallel for it in
 all, either History, or Nature, but the
 " *Mysteries of the Egyptians.* For, as the
 " *Egyptians* were at prodigious Cost, in
 " making, and setting up a great number
 " of Images, in and about their Temples --
 " by which *Hieroglyphicks* they pretended
 " to Teach men the Secrets of Natural Phi-
 " losophy — But when ask'd to Explain
 " their meaning, they gave a very mean
 " and trifling sense; or a sense very absurd
 " and false. So, after *Trinitarians* have
 " long Amused their Disciples with *Terms*,
 " as mystical as the *Egyptian Hierogly-
 " phicks*, such as *Trinity* — We would
 " easily forgive them the folly of their *A-
 " mysteries*, if their *Hieroglyphick Language*
 " were not as *False* and *Contradictory*, as it
 " is *Vain*, and *Trifling* — A little after
 this, speaking of the Blessed *Trinity*; " This
 " is *Egyptian* all over: 'Tis the very Ge-
 " nius, and Spirit of the old Mystical *Hie-
 " roglyphicks*: That is to say, Partly *Foolish*
 " and Partly *False*. Once more, " For my
 " Part, I never think of these, whether *Do-
 " tages* or *Impostures*, without such an In-
 " clination as I hardly Resist, of applying to
 " our *Athanastian Doctors*, what *Cato* said of
 " the *Roman Augures* and *Auspices* —
 " He knew their pretended Learning and
 " Discipline, was the *Religion*, *Establish'd*
 " by *Law*, warranted by *Custom* and *Pre-
 " scription*, and *Authorized* by the *Con-
 sent*

" sent of *Laws*. For all that, 'twas a *Cheat*
" so *Gross* and *Palpable*, that he could not
" but Admire the *Augures* were such *stark*
" *Fools*, or such *perfect Knaves*, that (meet-
" ing) they could carry a grave look upon
" one another.

This is the Kindness the English *Socini-
ans* have for the *Orthodox*, and more espe-
cially for the Religion by Law Establisht.
They make us worse than *Turks*, and as bad
as *Pagans*; as if all we teach were a *Gross*
and *Palpable Cheat*. And by their Com-
plaints of the Evils arising from Church
Preferments, and the Care and Favour of a *confederate
wealthy Mother*, they show they have an *or Exptic*
aking Tooth at the Church Revenues: Let p. 44.
the *Bishops*, *Deans*, and *Chapters* look to
themselves.

S E C T. IV.

*The Difference there is between the
English and Foreign Socinians.
The Foreign Socinians Represent
the Principles Embraced by the Ge-
nerality of the English, so to be Heret-
ical, tending to Mahometanism,
and Judaism.*

THE English *Socinians* do not make us
so bad, but *Socinus*, and his Partizans
abroad, are even with them, making their

Case the same with the worst of Hereticks,
Mahometans, and *Jews*.

To clear thus much, I must show what the Foreign *Socinians* hold, touching *Christ's* Divinity, and the Worship due unto him; together with the Representation given of such as do herein differ from them.

When *Vujekus* charged the *Socinians* with *Mahometanism*, *Socinus* in his Answer declares, "That they held *Jesus Christ* *Praef. Vujek.*" to be that Man, who was by the *Holy p. 8. Ed. A.* "Conceived in the Womb of the *Virgin D. 1624.*" *gin Mary*, and Born of her, that this "Man is the only begotten Son of God, "whom the Holy Scriptures Recommend "unto us, nor is there any other besides, or "before him. To this Man is given, by "God the Father, such a *Divine Power* "and *Authority*, that the Name of God "and *Divine worship* is Deservedly and "Necessarily, *per se*, given unto him.

This is their Doctrine, the Foundation of their Religion, the Great and Glorious Mystery of their Gospel, without the Belief of which no Salvation can be had. "Al-
Socia. ubi sup. p. 19." though, (say they) *Christ* never Expressly said *He was the true God*, yet from what he has oft declared, it may Easily, yea "Necessarily be inferred that *He* is; that "is to say, as *he* is really and truly Invested "with Divine Power and Authority— "And there are several Texts in the Holy "Scriptures which make it most clear, that "not only the *One God*, but that *Jesus Christ* also, as *he* is distinguished from *that*

“that One God, is to be Adored with Divine Worship. Time would fail me to enumerate the many Texts, that are not only in the New Testament, but also in the Old, for the Worshipping Jesus Christ, as distinguished from that One God, with Divine Adoration They then, *ubi sup. p.*
“who deny it to be Lawful to give Divine 27.
“Worship to Two Gods, whereof One is Subordinate unto the Other, and wholly depends on him, may as well deny the Sun shines in the clearest Day, and do more over discover their Ignorance of the Great Mystery of Christian Religion, and if Treated with Rigor, must be Deprived of the very Name of Christians— That they who are against rendering unto Christ Divine Worship, or oppose the Invocating him, are to be Condemned for Hereticks, yea for worse than Hereticks, in that truly they deny unto him the Care of the Church, which is the same, with their Denying him to be Christ.

This is the Notion they have Espoused of Jesus Christ, They Affirm him to be a True God, a True Subordinate God, entirely depending on that One, Most High God. A True God, because this One God hath given to him Divine Power and Authority; or as they sometimes Express it, because God hath by his Inhabiting Word, or Power, given to the Lord Christ a Faculty of Knowing all things, and an Ability to Relieve all Wants. This Divinity in Christ they make to be the Ground and Reason of their

their Adoration, and Invocation. They do also make God's dwelling in *Christ* by his Spirit, a Ground of Worship. *Socinus*, in the Defence of his Animadversions, on the *Theological Assertions* of the *Posnan College*, against *Gabriel Eutropius*, tells us, "To justify our Adoring *Christ*, it's sufficient, that God doth in an Eminent manner, by his Spirit, dwell in him, speak in him, give Answers, whence he is called the Image of the Invisible God, and they who have seen *Christ* are said to have seen the Father, and they who Adore him, do in him Adore the Father: If then the *Israelites*, who Worshipped before the Ark of the Covenant, because God shewed himself in it present to them, and as from his proper and peculiar Place, There gave Answers, and after a sort There dwelt, were free from the Guilt of Idolatry, much more may we be so, tho' we Worship *Christ*, of whom the Ark was but a Type, or Shadow, and infinitely below him.

This way of Arguing, tho' used by a Man of Note amongst our selves, was so turn'd by *Fujekus*, and *Bellarmino*, two Jesuits, against *Socinus*, as to Confound him.

Ref. ad Vujejk. p. 418. "That *Christ* is worthy of Divine Worship (say they) because God dwells in him, is by no means to be Allowed; For then 'twould follow, that the whole World may be Worshipped, especially the Angels, and Holy Men, in whom God doth in a more peculiar manner dwell.

And

And as the *Socinians* do make this sort of Divinity, the Reason of their giving Divine Worship unto *Christ*, even so, their Ascribing this Divinity, and giving Divine Worship unto him, makes the Discriminating Character, by which alone they hope to *Animadv.* clear themselves, from being of the Religion *in Assert. p.* Invented by *Mahomet*, which doth not In 49.
vocate, nor Worship him "No One (faith *Vid. Defens.*
" *Socinus*) who is in his Wits will affirm, *Animadv.*
" that False Notion *Mahomet* had of *Jesus* p. 373.
" of *Nazareth*, is what *Paulus Samosate-*
" *nus* held: For *Samosatenus* acknowledg-
" ed *Jesus Christ* to be the True, and only
" Begotten Son of God and our Lord; af-
" firming, that he ought to be Worshiped,
" &c. which things *Mahomet* denied

They insist so very much on the Adoration of *Christ*, that they esteem those, who are against it, to be such *Hereticks*, as subvert the very Foundations of Christianity, and deserve not the Name of *Christians*. "I do
" not (faith *Socinus*) see any thing through- *De Invocat.*
" out the whole *Christian Religion* of more *Christ. ex*
" Importance to be Published, than a *De-*
" *monstration*, that *Invocation*, *Adora-* *Epist. ad*
" *tion* or *Divine Worship* belongs to *Christ*, *Quend. Tom.*
" altho' he is a *Creature*— If this be
" but once fully proved, all the strong holds
" of the *Trinitarians* will fail them. For,
" they lean on this one Foundation, *viz.*
" That that *Adoration*, and *Invocation*,
" which is due only to the Most High God,
" must be given unto *Christ*. And on the
" other hand, the True Power, and Majesty
" of

“ of *Christ*, will hereby be cleared and firmly fixt in the minds of all ; whereas without the Knowledge of it, neither God himself, nor any thing Divine can be Rightly Understood, nor the way of our Salvation clearly Known ; but what is said in the Holy Scriptures of the Expiation of our Sins by *Christ*, will be strangely mistaken ; the whole of Christian Religion brought into Doubt, or at least exposed to a sudden Change, if not to utter Ruin : and the Chiefest, and most Principal Foundations of our Hope, and Trust in God destroyed. And elsewhere

Socin. he faith, “ That they, who are against the *Christ. Rel.* “ Worship of *Christ*, cannot be *Christians*, *Instit. Tom.* “ because in good earnest they own not *I. p. 656.* “ *Christ*, though they dare not *Openly*, yet “ *Really* do they deny *Jesus* to be the “ *Christ*.

Besides *Vujekus*, upbraiding the *Socinians*, with the Opinion and fatal end of *Jacobus Paleologus*, who with *Johannes Sommerus*, *Matthias Glirius*, and many others, opposed the Adoration of *Christ*, and was at last Burnt for his *Heresies* at *Rome*; *Socinus* in his Reply tells them his Sent’ thus :

Resp. ad Vujek. p. 42. “ But as to *Paleologus*, whom they take for granted to be One of Us, I answer, “ that his being Reconciled to the Church of *Rome*, was so far from being a Token of God’s Favour unto him, that it was a due Reward of his Impiety. For, besides his not sticking to Traduce our Party, how Innocent soever, as the most Arrant Knaves, whom

" whom in the mean time he Blushes not to
" call Brethren : He also was one, and if I
" mistake not, a leading Man among them,
" who now a days affirm, that *Christ* is ne-
" ther to be Adored, nor Invocated. And
" yet they Impudently Profess themselves
" Christians, a Device, to deprave our Re-
" ligion, in my Opinion, so Wicked, that
" there could hardly be a Worser invented.

And as they could not Oppose the Adora-
tion of *Christ* and Remain Christians, so
this their Principle, leads 'em to Judaism ;
" For (faith *Socinus*) ever since I saw what
" *Franciscus Davidis* had Written against
" the Invocation of *Christ*, I openly de-
" clared my Sentiments, touching the Ten-
" dency of his Notion to Judaism ; and how
" it exalted *Moses* above *Christ* : For this
" Reason more especially ; because if they
" hold, that *Christ* may not be of Right
" Invocated, he is not *Really*, but only in *Socin. Praef.*
" Name, *Christ*. And I Remember very *ad Resp. F.*
" well, that in the Presence of *Franciscus David.*
" *Davidis*, I pressed *Glirius* freely to tell
" me whether he believed *Jesus* of *Naza-*
" *reth* to be the *Christ*. But he would give
" me no Answer, &c.

What *Socinus* hath on this occasion de-
livered, doth sufficiently evince, that he
Condemns not only *Franciscus Davidis*,
but all whosoever they be, that are against
the Rendring Divine Worship unto *Christ*,
even our *English Socinians* themselves, if
they do so, for being far worse than Her-
etics, who in Reality deny *Jesus* to be the
Christ,

Christ, and therefore can't be *Christians*, nor clear *themselves* from the Charge of *Mahometanism*; nor their *Principles* from a Tendency to *Judaism*.

Now that the Generality of the *English Socinians* do Reject the Adoration of *Christ*, and are for giving him no other sort of Honour, than they do to Men in Civil Power, to Prophets or Saints in Glory, is manifest from what they avouch.

*Answe. to
Milborn,
p. 50.*

page 33.

' There are, say they, no Acts of Worship ever required to be paid to the Lord ' Jesus Christ, but such as may be paid to ' a Civil Power, to a Person in High Dignity and Office; to Prophets and Holy ' Men, or to such as are actually possest of ' the Heavenly Beatitudes.

Though some may be otherwise minded, yet the Generality of them fall in with *Palaeologus*, *Sommerus*, *Glirius*, *Davidis*, and Others, in their Rejecting the Adoration of our Blessed Redeemer, as appears further from what is Reported of them, by their own Historians, who Represents their Opinion to the utmost Advantage he could; intimating, that the most Learned of the Ancients Reject this Invocation; that *Christ* Himself, when consulted about the Object, and matter of Prayer, directed his Disciples to God; that he forbade them to pray to Himself; and that to make *Christ* himself the Object of Prayer, is to destroy his Mediatory Office. Thus much, and abundantly more, is urged by the *English Socinians*, against our Adoring and Invocating the *Lord Jesus Christ*;

where-

whereby they make themselves in the Esteem of the Foreign, who are the more learned *Socinians*, to be worse than Hereticks, even Destroyers of the Chiefest, and most Principal Foundations of the *Christians* Hope and Faith in God; who in Reality deny *Jesus of Nazareth* to be the *Christ*, and cannot clear themselves from *Mahometanism*, nor their Principles from *Judaism*.

Thus we see what manner of Men our *Socinians* are, what Enemies to *Christian Religion*, and whither their Principles do lead, the Chief among themselves being Judges.

And when I consider what manner of Nations the most Ingenious, of their way, are Advancing, I cannot but think on what *Mersennus* did intimate to *Ruarus*, about Epist. Ru-
the Attempts of some, to bring all that ar. 50.
part of *Religion*, which is necessary to Sal-
vation, unto one Article. ‘ There are (faith
‘ he) some Men, and I doubt not but there
‘ are such amongst you, who contend, that
‘ this one Article of Faith only, namely,
‘ That *Jesus is the Messiah*, is necessary
‘ unto Salvation; that they who believ it,
‘ may be called the Children of God; that
‘ this is the One Article the Apostles
‘ urged. To which others add, that a Be-
‘ lieving this Article with the Heart, is not
‘ required as necessary, a Confession of it
‘ with the Mouth being Sufficient: That is
‘ to say, if there be a rendring Obedience
‘ to the Magistrates Commands. Thus we
‘ see whither Men, when left to themselves,
‘ will run. They’ll suspect all *Religion* to
‘ be

' be false, and a Politick Contrivance ; then
 ' turn *Atheists*, not only denying a Prov-
 ' ience, but the very Being of God Him-
 " self.

Mersennus writing thus much to a Grave
 and Learned *Socinian*, who in his Answer
 taking no notice of it, though very careful
 to rectifie the most inconsiderable Mistakes in
 other Instances, moves me to conclude, the
 Charge was true, and the *Atheistical Con-*
sequences too manifest to admit of a Denial,
 which I the rather suggest, to the end I may
 stir up the more sincere amongst our *English*
Scocinians, to consider the Tendency of their
 Notions.

S E C T. V.

*They fall in with the Papists in some
 momentous Points. They imitate
 the QUAKERS, in their crying
 down LEARNING, a LEARN-
 ED MINISTRY, and in REVI-
 LING THEIR ADVERSARIES.*

§. 1. **T**H E *Papists* we confess, that
 they may support their Temporal
 Grandeur and Dominating Will, when
 pressed by the invincible Arguments of *Pro-*
testants, lower the *Mysteries* of the *Blessed*
Trinity and *Incarnation*; and level them
 with their *Unscriptural, Unreasonable, and*
Nonsensical Doctrine of Transubstantiation,
 rather

rather than Hazard their Temporalities ; which they do by placing *Transubstantiation* and these *Mysteries* in the same Rank.

Now, altho' the Doctrines of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, are most firmly believed by Protestants, as supported by the clearest *Revelations* in Holy Writ, yet the English *Socinians*, as if their Design had been to prepare the Minds of the People, to close with the most pernicious part of Popery, are bold to declare, that the whole of Popery hath as much Evidence for it, as these Foundations of Christianity. They do not only pres^s us with the Assertion of the Popish Doctors, that the Doctrine of the Trinity is Founded, not in the Scriptures, but on the Tradition of the Church ; and with the Charge, that we Blasphemously make the *Holy Scriptures a Nose of Wax*. But are (I cannot forbear saying) so Impudent, as to tell us, " That the Supremacy of the Pope, was the First-born of the Trinity ; " that from the Doctrine of the Incarnation, " arose the Worshiping of the Blessed Virgin, the Apostles and other Saints, Transubstantiation, and the Worship of Images. " But, what Connection can there be betwixt the Trinity and the Pope's Supremacy ? Or why must the Apostles be Religiously Worshipped, because the Humane Nature of Christ, who is God, was born of the Virgin ? Is there any Sense, or any Learning in such Sophistry ? No certainly, and therefore,

Acts of Great Athanasius

Pag. 3.

Catechism Pref.

Letter of Resolu. con-

cerning the

Trinity and

Incarnation

p. 12.

Acts of Athanasius
pag. 4.
Some Thoughts
pag. 12.

§. 2. They do with the *Quakers*, in the next place, cry down *Learning*. They Charge us, for doing what is next to the Denial of the Holy Scriptures, in that we elude (say they) the Plainest Text by *Scholastick*, and *Metaphysical Subtilties*. I " know very well (saith One, speaking of " Us) why they fancy *Socinians* to be " *Subtile Men*; It is because they oppose that " *Vain Learning*, which hath been intro- " duced into the most Popular *Catechisms*, " and unto which, most Men are Inured— " *The Dirty Spring*, which hath Afforded " their *False Learning*, is the *Gnosticism*, " which boasted of *Great Mysteries*; but " of no *Holy Practices*. They were the first " *Hereticks*, who made *Perfection* to consist " in *High Knowledge*.

They also talk of the Mischievous Feats of *Learning*, confirmed by *Disputes*, be- " tween *Protestants* and *Papists*. " Both " of 'em (say they) will make use of *Meta- " physics*, and by the Help of such *Theo- " logical Instruments*, each one will free " himself from Difficulties, and it shall not " be known, which of them gets the better. " In Effect, each one will avoid the most " pressing Arguments, by contriving a Di- " stinction more absurd than the very Op- " nion which he maintains, one absurdity " helping on another; or by finding out a " New Sense of the Authority brought " against them.

They being sensible, that, when we Dis- " course of the *Blessed Trinity*, and *Incarna- " tion*

tion, by the help of such Learning as their Sophistical Arguments are Detected, and Exposed, do find themselves necessitated to cry it down, or give up their Cause. The Latter they are not willing to do, and therefore oppose the Former, whereby the Herd of that Party are led Blindfold to a closure with such Notions of God, as are Destructive of his very Being. For, whilst they are arguing against Scholaſtick Terms, ſuch as *Trinity*, *Coessentiality*, *Modality*, *Personality*, *Eternal Generation*, *Proceſſion*, *Incarnation*, *Hypostatical Union* and the like; They meet with another Army of School Terms; which are necessary to give us the clearer Ideas, of what may be known of God, ſuch as *Infinity*, *Eternity*, *Immenſity*, *Absolute Simplicity*, *Pure Act*, *Incorporeity*, *Incomprehensibility*. And that they may the more roundly reject the *Trinity*, and *Incarnation*, they ſet themſelves againſt the *Infinity*, *Immenſity*, *Simplicity*, *Incomprehensibility*, &c. of the Deity; and thereby turn the Glory of the Incorrumpible God into the Image of Corruptible Man.

*Some
Thoughts p.
14.*

" To know (ſaith One of 'em) whether " there is an *Immenſity* of *Essence* or of " *Operation*, theſe are *Metaphysicks*, out " of my Reach—Revelation doth not " ſpeak precisely about this. *A page or
two before—* " The *Confessions of Faith* " which are puffed with *Metaphysical* " Terms are nothing else but a *Debaucht* " *Faith*.

Preface to his Catechism.

What Notion then have they formed of God? Their Admired *Biddle* will tell you, "God hath a *Shape*, hath his place in the Heavens, and knoweth not our free Actions, till they come to pass — — Thus they make God to be another such as themselves, which is the Effect of that Contempt they cast upon Learning. For when once they have with the *Papists*, made *Ignorance the Mother of Devotion*, they soon impose what they list on their Illiterate Admirers.

But seeing so long as Learned Men are amongst us in Reputation, 'twill be impossible for them to conceal from every body the real worth of such Studies; or, for themselves to escape the strength of their Arguments. To make sure work therefore of it, their next Endeavour is to load such Persons with the v'left Reproaches.

§. 3. They vilify the Learned now, as the Quakers formerly have done. "The *Exhort. to Free Enqui- ty. p. 3.*" Learned say they (if you speak of such as are *Priests*, and *Ministers*, or *Beneficed Men*) have such a Byass given to their Minds by the Awe of their Superiors, to whom they are Accountable by Fears of Deprivation, in Case of Professed Herodoxy, by their Subscriptions (before they were able to Judge) to the Articles of their several Churches; that it may be said their Learning gives no Authority to their Opinion. Tis plain enough their Opinions are such as the Conditions and Terms of Preferment, (appointed by the Laws of the Country) do Require of them, except

“ except when a Party is grown Powerful
“ enough to despise or to evade the Laws.—
“ While they are shackled by early Subscrip-
“ tions, Hopes of Preferment, Fears of Pu-
“ nishment, and the like Restraints, they are
“ fitter to support the Kingdom of Darkness,
“ than to revive the true Light, and Ge-
“ nuine Gospel of our Lord Christ.

None can escape their Revilings, neither
my *Lord of Worcester*, nor my *Lord of Glo- Answer to
cester*: No, not his Grace the late *Arch- bisho^p. p. 44.*
Bishop. These are made the great Pen-
niers of the World.

“ 'Tis certain (say they) we have a mighty
“ Propensity to believe, as is for our Interest
“ and Turn. Men will perswade themselves
“ to a great deal, only to be Quiet. But if
“ you bribe 'em too, with great Rewards,
“ what w'll they not say? what will they
“ not do? But the *Church* hath taken a
“ further care to keep her Sons in the Right
“ way; for the *Fears*, and *Awes*, she pro-
“ poses are even Greater than her Bribes.
“ For as they who bestow their Children
“ upon the *Church*, reckon they are Amply
“ provided for, in the Care and Favour of
“ so Wealthy a Mother; and therefore sel-
“ dom give those Children any further In-
“ heritance: So this is the Occasion that
“ these Adopted Sons, should they do, or
“ affirm any thing contrary to the Com-
“ mands, or the Declarations of the *Church*,
“ they are sure to starve, because they are
“ sure to be cast out: I think therefore it's
“ no Immodesty to say, that our *Opposers*

" being under the Power of such Fatal Biases ; their Doctrine is the more to be suspected, and the more to be examined, because 'tis theirs. They are Great Men indeed, every way great, that Defend against us the Doctrine of the Trinity ; but then, 'tis that they must maintain it. Set 'em at Liberty, Discharge 'em of their Awes and Fears : Let the Church Preferments be proposed only as the Rewards of Learning and Piety, as they were first intended, not of holding these, or those Opinions and Doctrines ; and it shall be soon seen how many Eyes this Liberty would open.

These Passages do shew with what Tenderness, Respect and Modesty, English Socinians do Calumpniate their Learned Adversaries : Representing them as Guilty of some great Hypocrisy and vile Sensuality.

To pass such Fury towards single Persons (as when they call one *Trifling Undertaker*, *Answer* 20 and speak of the Farce of his Life ; and another must be not *Furious Jebo*, but *Mad Driver*) I cannot forbear intimating how they deal with the Orthodox by whole sale. And first for the *French* : Such as know the *French* Ministers (say they) know very well that they are so far from being *Socinians*, that they never rightly understood what *Socinianism* is. They are so perfectly ignorant of the Merits of the *Socian* Cause, and Questions : And 'tis notoriously known, they are not Conver- fiant enough in good Books to Distinguish

Answer 20 *I am. p. 20.* " *nians*, that they never rightly understood

" Socinianism from Remonstrantism. Nor *Hbi sup. p.*
 is their Rage only against their Doctrines, ^{If he, and} 21.
 but so great, that as *French Refugees*, they *his Frater-*
Represent them for Peepers, Lurchers, ^{nity would}
Trepans, Vile Informers, Perjured Persons, not be sur-
 and the like; as if the Deprivation of their *ther expo-*
 Liberty, Property, and Native Air in their ^{sed, not only}
 own Land, did not satisfy their Malice, un- ^{here, but in}
 less they exposed them as much as they could ^{they will}
 in another. The Learned *Calvinists* then ^{for the time}
 next, in *Holland*, are made to be as sottish- ^{to come take}
 ly Ignorant as the *French*. But I will for- ^{some Hon-}
 bear such Quotations; and returning to our ^{ster Course.}
 own Country Men, I cannot but take parti- ^{Answer to}
 cular Notice of one Passage, in Reference to ^{Lam. p. 21.}
 the Reverend and Learned Doctor *Bull*. ^{Answer to}
 Take their own words. " Doctor *Bull* hath ^{Dr. Bull. p.} 77.
 " (say they) expressed such Malevolence,
 " and hath so Notoriously and Infamously
 " broke the *Chartal of Honour* and *Civi-*
 " *ty*;—that no Respect nor Tenderness can
 " be shown to him, by any *Unitarian*. His
 " Barbarities, and Immanities, towards a
 " Person so little deserving that usage, and
 " so much above Mr. *Bull* in all regards, as
 " *Sandius* was, and his *Arrogance* towards,
 " and *hair-brain'd Contempt* of all *Unita-*
 " *rians*, whether *Ancient* or *Modern*. I say
 " his *Temerity*, and *Extravagancy* in this
 " kind, is so excessive, or rather so *out-*
 " *ragious*, that he hath left to himself no
 " manner of Right or Claim, to the very
 " least Degree of Humanity, or good man-
 " ners towards him.

But what has this Learned Doctor done to deserve all this? " He never calls the " *Arians* by any other Name but *Arioma-*
" *nite*, the *Mad Arians*; and *Socinianism*
" is always with him, the *Atheistical Her-*
" *sie*. Of *Sandius* he saith, He hath ship-
" wrackt his Conscience, as well as his
" Faith. He complements the Author of
" *Irenicum Irenicorum* (who was Dr. *Zwic-*
" *ker*, M. D. a *Socinian*) with such Flow-
" ers as these—*Eripedium ineptissimum*, The
" Greatest Fop in Nature: *Omnia odio,*
" *qui veritatem & Candorem amant*,
" *dignus*.

This is a Summary of the Provocations given to the English *Socinian* by Doctor *Full*; Whether they deserve that Wrath, and Rage, with which they have Treated him, I will distinctly Examine.

1. As to the Doctor's esteeming Socinianism an *Atheistical Heresie*, as there is too much Reason for such an estimate, so in due time, it may be fully Cleared.

2. That the Dr. calls the *Arians*, *Ario-
Judic. Ec-* *manitæ*, is no more than what some Fa-
thers and many others have done before him,
as the Doctor himself hath Observ'd against
Episcopius, where he shews, that as *Eusebius*,
in Representing the *Madness* of the *Mani-
chees* alludes into the Name of *Manes*, as
signifying so much; Even so *Gregory Na-
Orat. 20.* *Ariani vo-
cantur A-* *zianzen makes the same Observation on the
Name of Arius, *Apeρ ὁ τι μανίας επόνουμε-
πειονούμενος. A furore nomen habens Arius. On which,
the Note of Nicetas, is, Arius ἦν τις ἀπει-*
* Marte

à Marte dictus furioso, & bellacissimo Dæ- phanio *He-*
mone. And what harm in Rehearing what *refi LXIX.*
the Ancients have done. But, *p. 311. ab*

*Athanasio**Tractat. de**Synod. Tom.**I. p. 929.**Suicer.The-**Saur.in ver-**bo Apel. G-**Brief Hist.**p. 12.*

3. The Doctor saith that *Sandius* hath
ship-wrackt his Conscience. Whether this
*be true, or not, let an English *Socinian**
*Determine, who saith, "That *Sandius*, in*
*"all his Books, Refuses in *words* to be*
*"called either *Arian* or *Socinian*, but hath*
"written an Ecclesiastical History on pur-
*"pose to prove, that all Antiquity was *Ari-**
*"*an*, or *Socinian*—He hath also under the*
*"Borrowed Name of *Cingallus*, written a*
*"small Treatise, with this Title; *Scriptu-**
*"*ra Trinitatis Revelatrix*: Here, under*
"Pretence of Asserting the Trinity, he hath
"as much as he could defeated all the
"Strengths of the Catholick Cause.

Thus this Learned *Sandius* openly de-
 clares against the *Arian*, and *Socinian Heresies*, and Pretends to write in Defence of
 the *Trinity*, and therein doth his utmost to
 enervate all the Arguments brought to sup-
 port this Blessed Doctrine, and Defeat the
 Cause of the *Orthodox*, which is such an
 Evinement of a deliberated double-dealing,
 lived and delighted in, that none but an
 English *Socinian*, can look on it to be less,
 than a *Shipwracking of his Conscience*.

4. *Zuicker* is called *Socinian* by our Au-
 thor, and for ought I know, might be in his
 Heart so, altho he positively Declares, He
 is neither *Lutheran*, *Calvinist*, *Remonstrant* *Irenico-*
 or *Socinian*. However according to the *majt.perpet.*
 New Rule of these Gentlemen, he may be a
 very Sincere one. But *convict. p.*
8. ii.

But what is it that moved Doctor *Bull* to write so contemptibly of this *Zuicker*: What it is in Particular, being a perfect Stranger unto the Learned Doctor, I'll not pretend to Determine: And yet am apt to think, that amongst other Reasons, this may be one, *viz.*, *Daniel Zuicker*, being a Physician, Publisheth a Discourse, Entituled *Irenicum Irenicorum*, in which he pretends to do Wonders, boasting of his Infallible and Universal Remedy for the most obstinate Mental Distempers, which he doth with as much Vanity, and as little Reason, as ever Quack hath done of his *Elixir Salutis*, or *Orvietan*. That the Reader may see I have not by this suggestion broke the Chartal of Honour and Civility, I will Transcribe some of *Zuicker's* Boasts, and then add his Infallible Cure.

In the *Title Page*, of his Book, we have enough of his boasts. For there he hath it thus—*Irenicum Irenicorum, seu Norma Triplex Exempli peculiari Theologico, eoque Illustrissimo—ita ob oculos Posita; ut si secundum ejus Fundamentales Infallibilisque Decisiones procedatur, Controversia quævis, etiam si Gravissimæ, feliciter, breviter, & sine tumultu, conciliorumque Convocatione ullâ decidi; amissa, ignorata hactenus Veritas recuperari; Adversarii autem Quilibet vel pertinacissimi, juxtim cum Conciliis Hæreticis, judicari, convinci, & confundi queant.*

And lest any should be frightned with this Rhodomontado Title, he doth what he can in

is his Preface to *Cajole* his Reader to think well of it : " *Noli* (says he) *mirari Lector*
" *Titulum hujus libri, Talia tibi Promit-*
" *tere, quæ à multis retro seculis, imo ab*
" *ipso pene Apostolorum ævo inaudita*
" *fuere.*

Once more I must Observe that this Renowned *Zuicker*, was so puffed up with the Conceit he had of his *Catholicon*, that he cannot forbear making a Break in the Beginning of his Book, to the end he might insert another Pompous Title, before the third Branch of his Argument: by which he endeavours to Prove the Soundness of his Conciliatory Rule. The Title begins thus, **ORBIS CATHOLICUS** *in potissimum suis Traditionibus de Fide primorum Christianorum EXTREME ERRANS*— *seu VERA prime Antiquitatis fideique primorum Christianorum MONUMENTA*: *Ad dudum amissam Veritatem, pa-* *cemque Ecclesiæ postliminio restituendam,* **ORBI CHRISTIANO** *clarius quam un-* *quam antebac ob oculos posita.*

This is it our Socinian Doctor tells the World: He hath a rare Secret, scarce heard of since the Apostles Days, till he Discovered it, but now so admirably well done, that if there be an Observing his Fundamental, and Infallible Decisions, 'twill without any other help, safely and suddenly decide the most Important Controversies, Recover lost Truth, Judge, Convince, Confound any Adversary with their Heretical Counsels, be they never so Pertinacious and Obstinate.

And

And whereas the Catholick World, hath been extreamly Ignorant of the Traditions of the Primitive Christians, unknown to every body, he took 'em out of Petavius, and Published them.

But what is this rare Secret ? this Wonderful *Catholicon*, I mean his *Conciliatory Rule* ? It lyeth only in the Denial of Christ's Divinity. All, if they will have Peace with them, must hold that *Jesus Christ* is not the most high God. This is his healing Truth ; which he undertakes to prove from the Holy Scriptures, *Sound Reason* and *Ancient Tradition*, being induced to pitch on this, as *Lemonicamast.* the most likely Expedient, by the Observations he made, of Men's casting off, their malevolent Humour on their turning *Socians* ; Of the certainty and clearness with which twas Demonstrated, and the Hopes he hereupon conceived of the Conversion of Infidels.

Pag. 14.

• But can any Man, in his Wits, think ; that we, who are fully Perswaded in our Consciences, of the Truth of Christ's Divinity, and that the Belief of it is absolutely Necessary to Salvation, can renounce this Principle for the sake of Peace with them ? This is as if one, amongst us, should start up, and cry earnestly for a Peace with France, proposing no other Terms, than an entire Resignation of our Laws, Liberty and Property, to the Pleasure of their Grand Monarch. What could the English think of such a Fellow ? would they think him *Compos Mantis* ? or would they not be for fending

sending him to *Bedlam*? And yet of this Nature is *Zuicker's Project* for a Catholick Union : And that made Doctor *Bull* speak so Rightfully of it. Whether the Doctor, hath herein broke the *Chartel of Honour*, and *Civility*; or deserved such *Usage* from this English *Socinian*, I leave to the Palate of the whole English Church, unto whom a Relief of *Christ's Deity*, which he would have us Reject, is as Necessary to our Future Bliss, as our Laws, Liberties, and Properties are to the Present Peace, and Tranquillity of the Nation.

These few Intimations are sufficient to convince us, that the English *Socinians* have undertaken the Defence of a bad Cause, and therefore are driven to so many miserable Shifts; one while striking in with the *Papists*, yet otherwhile with the *Quakers*, crying down Learning, Railing at Learned Men, and become more shameful Revilers of their Adversaries than others.

SECT. VI.

Their Boasts of Learned Men on their Side. Their Claim to the Fathers, in the Opinion of some Foreign Socinians Groundless. Calvin not Displeased with the Term [TRINITY.] Grotius not Socinian all over.

A Suspicion that these Methods may fail of the desired Success, puts 'em on Attempts

Attempts of a contrary kind : And therefore, in case *Learning*, and *Learned Men* keep up their Esteem, they tell us, " That the *Exhort. to Unitarians* have a particular Reputation, *a Free Eng. f. 3.* " as most skillful in that, which is the *Proper Learning of Divines, The Sacred Criticism*, and are talk't of by their *Adversaries*, as a fort of *Subtile, Rational and Discerning Men.*

They lay a Claim to the *Anti-Nicene Fathers*; and to several *Learned Men* amongst *Modern Writers*, who indeed are none of theirs. Whence it is, that the most *Learned Socinians* abroad, such as *Socinus, Crellius* as *Gittichius* avers, confin'd themselves in their Arguments, to the *Holy Scriptures*, and *Sound Reason*.

This *Gittichius* saw the *Fathers* to be so much against them, that instead of *Appealing unto them*, He represents them, as *Epist. Resp. ad Ruar.* a Company of *Ignorant Foolish Scribblers*, not more fit to determine Controversies of this Nature than *Blind Men* are to Judge of Colours. And whereas a very Eminent Person, had offered some *Scruples* against the *Doctrines of Socinus*, amongst which one was their being Embraced only by the *Ebionites, Cerinthians, and Arians*, in the first Ages of Christianity : *Socinus* in his *Answer*, tells us, that their *Doctrines* were clearly Revealed in *Scripture* : That if some men perceiv'd it not, it was their own Fault : That how great soever their Ignorance was, 'twas not in those Points without the Knowledge of which there could be no *Salvation*.

And

And what was said of *Ebion, Cerinthus, and Arius*, concern'd not them, for not one of *Quae hic de*
them Defended what they held. *Ebione, Cerintho,*

And in his Answer to *Vujekus*, he is more full ; Declaring, that as the Authority of the Fathers could be of no weight when put in the Scales against the Holy Scriptures, so they, *lay no claim unto them*, no not to those, who were before the *Nicene Council*. *rem non faciunt cum nemo illo- rum ipsam sententiam*

" The many Authorities and Testimonies, *nostram De-*
" (faith he) taken out of the Fathers and fenderit—
" Councils, are of no Force at all, especi- *Socin. So-*
" ally amongst us, who Own that we dissent *lut. Scrut-*
" from them, which are extant : Not can *pul.—*
" it be shown, that any of our way affirmed *Socin. Resp.*
" the *Anti-Nicene Fathers*, which are now *ad Vujek. 444.*
" extant, to be of our Opinion : Altho' we
" are all persuaded, they are no less, if not
" more against our Adversaries.

Howbeit, there have been some feeble Efforts put forth towards the Proving that the Fathers are *Theirs*, but such as have been to their shame, fully Confuted.

They have therefore endeavoured to shelter themselves under the Wings of *Calvin*, and *Luther*, as if They had been such *Nominal Trinitarians* as the *Sabellians*, and much displeased with the Use of the Term [*Trinity.*] " M. *Luther* complains the word *Nom. Real.*
" *Trinity* sounds oddly, it were better to call *Trin. p. 46.*
" Almighty God *GOD*, than *Trinity. Postil.*
" *major. Dominic.* Mr. *Calvin* is less pleased with these kind of Terms : He says,
" I like not this Prayer, *O Holy, Blessed and Glorious Trinity.*] it favours of Bar-
barity —

"
"arity—The Word *Trinity* is Barba-
"rous, *Insipid*, *Frofane*, an Human Inven-
"tion grounded on no Testimony of God's
"Word. The Popish God, unknown to
"the Prophets and Apostles. *Admonit.* 1.
"*ad Polon.*

What *Luther* is brought in for, is not much to the Purpose, but if our *Socinians* have truly Represented *Calvin*, 'tis, I confess, a Quotation driven to the Head. But when upon this account I could not but very carefully examine his Admonition to the *Polonian*s, unto which he Refers us, I can find there no such Thing.

That the English *Socinian*'s Truth and Candour therefore may be the more set in the Light, I will bring to the Reader's View, what it is, *Calvin* doth say on this Occasion.

In *Calvin's Theological Traetates*, there is an *Answer to the Polonian Brethren*, Refuting the Error of *Stancarus*, who held that Christ was a Mediator, *only with Respect to his Human Nature*, whereby Christ's Epist. 1. p. Satisfaction, and Man's Redemption; are subverted, and as *Beza* affirms a Door is opened unto the *Tritheists*, who lead the Way to *Arianism*, as *Arianism* brings in the Blasphemies of *Samosatenus*, [the Grand Idol of *Socinus*.] After this Answer there is a *Brief Admonition sent to these Polonian*s, *Tract. Theol.* cautioning them against a cloſure with *Llan-*
Ed. 3. Ge- *drata*, in making to themselves *Three Gods*, *nev. A. D.* by Imagining the *Three Persons to be Three*
1611. p. *Essences*. But neither in the *Answer*, nor
683. &c. *Admo-*

Admonition is there a Word in Favour of the English *Socinians*. There is also an Epistle sent to the *Polonian* Nobility, and Gentry, and to the Worthy Citizens of *Cracow*, occasion'd by what *Christophorus Trecius, Stanislaus Sarnicus, and Jacobus Sylvius*, wrote to *Calvin* about the Various Arts, and Fraudulent Methods used by Hereticks, to ensnare the People into a Denial of *Christ's Divinity*, and a *Trinity* of Persons in the Unity of Essence. But nothing in this *Epistle* to Justify the Charge of our Gentlemen; it being notoriously Manifest, that *Calvin* was for the use of the Terms [*Trinity*, and *Persons*.]

In his Answer to *Blandrata's* Question, about the Name [*Person*] he is Positive,
" That the use of it is Necessary to Detect
" the Frauds of them, who craftily endeav-
" our to subvert the Foundations of our
" Faith. And in his *Epistles*, 'tis more Calv. Epist.
" fully declared, that the Terms [*Trinity*, Edit. 2. A.
" and *Persons*] are very Profitable to the D. 1576. p.
" Church of *Christ*, as by which the true
" Distinction between the Father, Son, and
" Holy Ghost, is more clearly discovered,
" and Vexatious Controversies more Effectually Prevented, for which Reason they
" were by no means to be laid aside.

'Tis true *Calvin* in his Letter to the *Polonian* Nobility expresses his Dislike of this Prayer, [*Sancta Trinitas, Unus Deus misericordia nostri*] *Precatio mihi non placet* (says he) & *omnino Barbariem sapit*. The Prayer, not the word [*Trinity*] disgusted

K him.

him. And whereas *Stancarus* had wrested the Scriptures ; affirming, that when 'tis said —— *There is One God, and One Mediator.* [*G O D*] there signifies the *Trinity*. *That they may know thee the only true* [*G O D*,] that-is the *Trinity*. *Whatever ye ask of the Father*, that is, of the *Trinity*: *Calvin*, in Opposition to these wretched Interpretations of *Stancarus*, saith,
 “ We reject them not only as *Insipid* but as
 “ *Prophane*. But what is this to his saying the Word [*Trinity*] is Barbarous, *Insipid*, *Prophane*, the Popish God, &c.? Or what Credit is there to be given to the Reports of an English *Socinian*? ”

Hist. Socin.
Lei. I p. II.

Amongst many others, *Grotius* is said by them to be *Socinian all over*. “ This Great Man (say they) in his Younger Years attacked the *Socinians* in a Principal Article of their Doctrine, But being Answered by *J. Crellius*, he not only never Replyed, but thanked *Crellius*, for his Answer, and afterwards writing Annotations on the whole Scriptures, he Interpreted every where according to the Sentiments of the *Socinians*. There is nothing in all his Annotations, which the more strict followers of *Socinus* his Doctrine do not approve, and applaud. His Annotations are a Compleat System of *Socinianism*, not excepting his Notes on the first Chapter of *St. John's Gospel*, which are written so Artificially and Interwoven with so many different Quotations, that he hath covered himself, and his

" his Sense of that Portion of Scripture, from
" such as do not read him carefully.

But to clear it, that this Great Man,
the Learned *Grotius* is not theirs: I will
offer the following Considerations.

First then, 'tis Manifest from what *Grotius* himself hath oft avowed, that altho' he did not Answer *Crellius*, yet he had not changed his Opinion touching what he had written of Christ's Satisfaction--In a Letter to *Reigersbergius*, he saith thus: In that I "did not make Reply to *Crellius*, I acted, as "I think, very Prudently, and according to "the Advice and Desire of the Reformed "Pastors in France, who not having that "Controversy started amongst them, Prayed "that I would not by writing a Confutation "of *Crellius* bring it in amongst their Peo- "ple. And in his Letter to *Vossius* he adds, "What need is there of my Repeating "what hath been already so fully done? "I am not afraid (as he told *Reigersberg*) of "any ones comparing the Texts I produced, "together with those Explications and Ar- "guments I urged to defend 'em, w'tli "what hath been writ against them: Nor "do I in the least doubt, but that an Equal "Judge will determine for me. And to "Vossius: If *Crellius* cannot Prove, that "it is *Unjust*, for *One*, by his own Con- "sent to bear the *Punishment* due to an- "other, which he will never be able to do, "the contrary being Agreeable to the Senti- "ments of the Wise in every Nation; "which, in that very Book *Crellius* an-

“ swered, and since the Publishing his Answer, in my Book *de Jure Belli & Pacis*: “ *Tit. de Pœnarum Commun. §. xi.* I have “ fully shewn, and design to do it yet more “ largely in my *Annotations Matt. 20. 28.* “ from Testimonies out of Hebrew Writers, “ a Copy of which I have given to Mr. “ *Goffe*, an English Divine, who came over “ chiefly to make me a Visit; twill most certainly follow, that neither *Socinus* nor “ *Crellius* had any Reason to leave the “ proper signification of the Word *λύτρον*, “ the Price of our Redemption, contrary to “ the most plain and manifest Sense of all “ Antiquity.

2. This Great Man doth moreover provoke them to his Verity of Christian Religion, for their Conviction, that *he had not altered his Opinion about Christ's Satisfaction*. “ If any, faith he desire to know what “ my Judgment is about the Points Contro- “ verted between *Crellius*, and my self, “ since the coming out of his Book, he may

Vid. Grot. “ see it from what I have written on the *de Veritate*. “ *fifty third of Isay*, in my Disputation *Lib. 5.*

“ with the Jews, and from what I have “ said in the close of my Book, *de Veritate*.

The *fifty third of Isay* he proves to be a Prophecy concerning the *Messiah*, and gives such a Sense of *Heb. 1. 3.* as is most opposite unto the Doctrine of *Socinus*. How then could our Historian Venture to make him *Socinian all over*? It is because *Grotius* wrote a Letter of thanks unto *Crellius*, on the Publishing his Book: To this I'll give

give you *Grotius's* own Reply, which
is,

3. "An Eminent English Divine spake Epist. ad
"to me of some Letters, which a while ago *Gul. Grot.*
"I had written unto *Crellius*, who writing p. 880.
"with the greatest Cahdour, and Civility
"unto me, I returned an Answer with the
"same Respect unto him: This Civility and
"Respect of mine to *Crellius*, the Follow-
"ers of *Socinus*, have turn'd into an Argu-
"ment for my Agreement with them, and to
"Insinuate this much have scattered abroad
"some Parts of my Letters, I wish, with all
"my heart, they had Published them whole
"and entire. Then it would appear plainly,
"that I have not, in the least altered my
"Judgment. In another Letter to his Bro-
ther *william*, he saith, "I have had some
"Discourse about these things with *Bister-* pug. 884.
"field, who told me, he understood from
"you, and I also have heard the same, that
"*Crellius* a little before his Death should
"say, that had he seen what I have written
"*de Pœnarum Communicatione*, in my
"*Book de Jure Belli & Pacis*, he would
"never have answered my Book *de Satis-*
"factione.

4. That he could not be *Socinian* all over,
is Evident from what he wrote to *Graf-*
winkelius, to whom he declared, "That Epist. ad.
"he did strictly Adhere to the Doctrines of *Grafwink.*
"the Fathers, not only about the *Trinity*, p. 137.
"but the *Two Natures in Christ*, satisfa-
"ction and other Points oppugned by *Soci-*
"nus and his Followers.

5 As for his Annotations, it's not clear to me, that the *Socinianism*, which is in them, is his; it looks rather as if those parts were some *Excerpta* taken out of *Socinian Commentators*, with a Design to Examine them.

Epist. ad Gal. Grot. pag. 903. And sure I am that *Grotius* did not only suspect *Curcellæus*, the Corrector of the *Preis*, as an Inconstant Man, under the Influence of such as were no Friends to him, hoping to be Restor'd to his Ministry in France; but is Positive, that *Curcellæus* made several changes in his *Annotations*, contrary to his mind, and will — *In Annotatis quædam contra meum Sensum, Curcellæus mutavit — quod nolim fieri.*

However, the English *Socinians* say, That *Grotius* is for them even in his Notes, on the first Chapter of St. John's *Gospel*, but then they Confess, " He hath written them so *Artificially*, and Interwove them with so many Quotations, that he hath cover'd himself and his sense of that Portion of Scripture, from such as do not read him carefully. This is a Generous sort of Confession, cunningly devised, and might have passed, had there not been some Learned and Careful Readers amongst us to Detect the Falshood of the Insinuation, which is very Excellently well performed to the Reproach of these bold Assertors, and pretendedly Wise Interpreters of Scripture.

These few Intimations I suppose may suffice to show what Pitiful Shifts the English *Socinians* are driven to, for the support of

of their Tottering Cause, wherein I confess they fail of the Learning, Candor, and Integrity of some *Foreign Socinians*. If *Grotius* must be looket on as a *Socinian*, saith *Gittichius*, who hath with a freedom Answerable to his Heat, Expressed his Resentments, he is a Betrayer of the Faith.

To this Purpose, *Gittichius* expreses himself, in an Epistle to *Ruarus*, where he charges *Grotius* for Writing in such a way, that without putting his Words on the Rack, 'tis impossible to secure 'em from Error. Thus it is with what he saith, concerning an *Appeasing* of the *Wrath* of God against us, by the Grievous Sufferings of *Christ*. "When *Grotius* saith that the "Pardon of Sin first offered to the *Israelites*, then to the whole World, Preached "by *Christ*, Confirmed by his Miracles, "Death, and Exaltation, was Purchased "for us by that most Perfect Sacrifice, the "Bloody Death of *Christ*, he affirms what "is most contrary to the Holy Scriptures, "and yet thus doth he do, in his Explicating "the sixth Verse of the first of the *Ephesians*. *Gittichius* concludes his Epistle with this Prayer, "The Lord grant unto *Grotius* a "Sounder Judgment, and secure his Church "from such as he is, and put forth his utter- "most Power, that there may not be at any "time such *Grotius's* in his Church: seeing "the Church is in much greater Danger "from such than from any open Enemies "and Antichrists.

Thus much Gittichius wrote to Ruarus, who, because of Grotius's Candour, represented him a Friend to their Party: but, as any one may see, Grotius was far from being Socinian all over.

S E C T. VII.

The deceitful Practices of Foreign and English Socinians. Blandrata, the Socinians Patron, by Flatteries and Subscriptions, gains a Reputation amongst the Orthodox. Calvin detects his Heresies and Frauds. He is reprimanded by Protestants, who look on Blandrata as an Angel. Calvin continues his Opposition. English Socinians break through Subscriptions, and profane Sacraments for the carrying on their Designs.

THE English Socinians, suspecting the Success of those *deceitful* and unrighteous Methods which they use to propagate their Errors openly; tho' they reject what is *most valuable* in their Brethren abroad, yet have imitated them in what hath, in the Esteem of their candid and judicious Adversaries, most exposed them. Thus much they have done, by joyning themselves to the *Orthodox*, with no other Design, than

than to subvert the Foundations of that Religion they profess, subscribe, and swear unto.

Valentinus Gentilis, and *Blandrata*, amongst many others, are famed Instances of the Truth of this Assertion; but I will only observe, what manner of Person *Blandrata* was, and what were his Practices.

George Blandrata, an Italian by Birth *Vid. Socin.* and sometimes chief Physician and Counsellor to *Stephen King of Poland*, was highly esteemed by *Faustus Socinus*, who dedicated to him his Answer to *Volanus*, as the great Patron of their Religion, as undoubtedly he was. However, *Blandrata* did for a long while so behave himself, as to obtain Applauses from the most eminent amongst the *Orthodox*, for the soundness of his Faith, and unspotted Sincerity.

Tis true, *Calvin*, after some considerable Converse with him, began to suspect him, and at last detected some of his *Heresies*, and the fraudulent Practices by which he attempted their Propagation. But soon was he reprimanded, by Men sound in the Faith, and of great Worth: One eminent Person rebukes him for exposing *Blandrata* his singular Friend, and as a Father to him most dear. *Felix Cruciger*, a *Polonian Minister*, after he had, in an Epistle to *Calvin*, evinced their Faith to be exactly the same with what was embraced by the Reformed at *Geneva* and elsewhere, saith, "That it appear'd to 'em, that *George Blandrata* did some Weeks ago seriously

*Vid. Socin.
Epist. ad
Blandrat.
p. 687.
edit. 1618.*

*Vid. Cate.
Ep. p. 257.*

" subscribe their Confession ; and , (say
 " they) we earnestly pray you, diligently
 " and prudently to consider his *Cafe*, and
 " impart to us a faithful Account thereof.
 The Ministers and Elders of the Church at
Vilna were much mov'd at *Calvin's* writing
 against him ; and therefore, after they had
 reprov'd him, do advise him to reconcile
 himself unto *Blandrata*, who was, to their
 Knowledge, a *most sincere* Man, free from
 the least Suspicion of Errors. For they be-
 lieved not a word of what *Calvin* had said
 to the contrary.

However, *Calvin* persists in the Opinion
 he had of *Elandrata*, and can by no means
 be taken off from exposing his Heresies and
 evil Practices ; expressing his Trouble to
 observe him, by his crafty method, to get
 such an Interest in the favour of so eminent
 a Person as his Anonymous Friend was. In
 his Letter to *Stanislaus* faith he, " I can-
 " not but observe, how all men, in a man-
 ner, as if they had been under a Fascina-
 " tion, admire *Blandrata* ; 'tis you alone
 " who begin to suspect the Truth of what is
 " said of him : but, that you may obtain a
 " more certain Knowledge of him, I must
 " tell you, that *Valentinus Gentilis*, whose
 " wild Notions I have confuted, is of the
 " same Faction, and another *Blandrata*,
 " altho the one will not give place unto the
 " other. If his *Frauds*, his *Ensnaring*,
 " and crafty Courses, had not been taken
 " notice of in *Poland*, it might have been
 " more tolerable ; but I am amaz'd to think,
 that

ubi sup.
258.

" that a Man who hath nothing else but
" *Pride* and *ostentation* to recommend him,
" should get such a Reputation amongst you,
" as to be esteemed the *Atlas*, that bears
" the Church on his Shoulders.

In his Answer to *Felix Cruciger*, and his
Colleagues, and other faithful Pastors and
Ministers in Lesser Poland; " There is one
thing I cannot but suggest unto you,
(faith he) that they who did with so
much Humanity and Respect entertain
Blandrata, were not so cautious and
wary, nor did they consult your Reputation
as they should have done; and am
more surprized, that some of the Chiefest
Rank are greatly offended, because I did,
as it became me, discover the Man. I be-
seech you not to believe that I have hastily
taken up any Reports; I have written a
Narrative, which will clear the Truth of
Matter of Fact. And to the Ministers
and Elders of the Church at *Vilna*, " Tho
you (faith he) have no Suspicion touch-
ing *Blandrata* (his Errors and Practices)
yet with me he is clearly *convicted*, and
so he is before this Church. Ye believe
not what I say, why then should I believe
what you say? You have much time to
spare to call *Synods* about such Trifles.
You admire him as if he had been an *An-
gel* dropped down from *Heaven*; but he is,
in other Nations, a Man of no Account.
A brief History of him I will give you;
and lest you should have no regard to what
I say, it is attested by the Elders of the

Italian

" Italian Church with us, and by the Re-
" nowned Peter Martyr.

The History they give of him is to this purpose " George Blandrata, a Physician, deigned himself amongst us for some time very peaceably, and with much Temper, desirous of Instruction; so that we innocently receiv'd him into our Number: At length he began to talk as if he design'd to call in question the Article of Christ's Divinity, and privately spread this Nation amongst the more ignorant. Then would he weary Calvin with his Enquiries, and seem abundantly satisfy'd with his Answers; but carry'd it so, that at last Calvin discover'd his perfidious and deceitful Courses, and his Carriage to be such, as made it necessary for the Senate to deal with him; where, altho he was convicted of notorious Falshoods against Calvin, yet never blush'd. His intimate Friend and Companion was Johannes Paulus Alciatus, who said, that we worship three Devils, much worse than all the Popish Idols, because we hold Three Persons. There arose a fresh Complaint of the Italian Church against him, for using Clandestine Arts to ensnare the Vulgar to a Closure with his Dotages.

Thus this Man, a real Enemy to the Fundamental Doctrines of Christian Religion, the great Patron of Socinus and his Partizans, to the end he might the more effectually propagate his Errors, pretends a Zeal for the Truth, joyns himself to the Orthodox,

Orthodox, subscribes sound Confessions, gains a Reputation amongst the chiefest of the Orthodox, for being sound and sincere.

This deceitful Method of *Hancrata* hath been exactly observ'd, as by many of the same Principles abroad, so by the *Socinians* in our Country; who, notwithstanding the Contradiction there is in the Doctrines by Law established to their Tenents, and the strict Subscriptions required of all that enter into the Ministry, get into the *Church*, and fix their Communion there.

That they may pave the way for the Consciences of others, their Attempts are, to make the *Subscription* to the Th'irty-nine Articles, to signify nothing. " Those The Belief of the Athanasian Creed not required by the Ch. of Eng. Thirty-nine *Articles* (say they) are not *Articles of Faith*, but Peace: As several of her most learned Bishops have declared; and, in a word, the Title of the Articles says as much, and the Preface before them. And yet in the Title, 'tis declared, that these Articles were agreed upon, for the avoiding *Diversities* of Opinion, and for the Establishing of *Consent*, touching true Religion. And in the Preface 'tis declared, That the Articles do Contain the True *Doctrine* of the Church of *England*, agreeable to *Gods word*: And the Charge his Majesty gives is, " That no Man shall either Print or Preach to draw the Article aside, any way; but shall submit to it, in the Plain, and full meaning thereof; And shall not put his own sense or Comment, to be the Meaning of the Article,

" Article , but shall take it in the *Literal*
 " or *Grammatical* Sense. So that whatever
 any Bishops have declared, The Import of the
 Title and Preface is, That the Subscribers
 Agree in Believing the Doctrines contained
 in the Articles to be *True* ; that the Arti-
 cles taken in the Literal and Grammatical
 Sense, are agreeable to God's word.

How can a *Socinian* then subscribe the
 first Article, where 'tis said ; " There is but
 " One Living and True God, and in Unity
 " of this Godhead, there be Three Persons,
 " of one Substance, Power and Eternity, the
 " Father , the Son and the Holy Ghost:
 Doth this Article contain in it the Truth?
 If it doth, the *Socinian* Principle is False;
 If it doth not, they subscribe to a *Lye*.
 And tho' the Church did not Require the
 Belief of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity,
 as delivered in the *Athanasian Creed*, as
 Necessary to Salvation ; Yet, seeing it Re-
 quires the Belief of this Doctrine as *True*,
 they who deny this Doctrine, can't, without
 being guilty of grossest Hypocrisy, subscribe
 it. But what can't a designing English *Socinian* do ?

Thus, you see, that tho' the Thirty-nine
 Articles are as expressly against the *Dogmata*
 of our *English Socinians* , as words can
 make them, yet can they not keep an *English*
Socinian out of the Church. And having
 broken their Subscriptions, they go on to
 tell us, " That they Place not Religion in
 " worshipping God by themselves or after a
 " Particular Form or Manner, but in a
 Right

" Right Faith, and a just and charitable
" Conversation : We Approve of known
" Forms, say they, of Prairing and Praying
" to God, as also in Administring *Baptism*,
" the *Lords Supper Marriage*, and the other
" Religious Offices : We like well of the
" Discipline of the Church by *Bishops*, and
" Parochial Ministers. We have an Esteem
" for the Eminent Learning and Exemplary
" Piety of the Conforming Clergy. For
" these Reasons, we Communicate with that
" Church as far as we can, and Contribute
" our Intrest to Favour her against all
" Others, who would take the Chair. We
" would not therefore, be Understood to be
" Enemies to the Church, nor as seeking to
" undermine her.

And that they may hold Communion
with the Church in her Sacraments, they
have framed such an Idea of 'em, as makes
it easy, for Men of their Opinions, to joyn
in the Sacraments, not only with the Church
of *Englaud*, but with *Presbyterian*, *Inde-*
pendent, *Anabaptist*, *Lutheran*, or *Papist*.
They do not look on the Sacraments as Or-
dinances of the Gospel, to which they must
go, that they may Partake of Spiritual
Blessings : In their Opinion, the Person
that Receives Baptisim, is only to Reslove
and Purpose Renovation and Newnes of
Life. " He doth (say they) thereby Pro-
" fess he will purge his Mind and Consci-
" ence, and his whole Conversation from
" Impurity and Wickedness. And concer-
ning the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*,

Trinitar.
Scheme
Confid. p. 26

They

" They commiemorate; and represent the
 " shedding the Lord's Blood, and breaking
 " his Body for Mankind. But for the mi-
 " raculous Effects and Consequences ascri-
 " bed to the right partaking of this Sacra-
 " ment, *Unitarians* can find them no where
 " but in the Books and Sermons of the
 " *Superstitious Admirers* (I might have
 " said *Idolaters*) of External Things.

If they had been perswaded that the Sacra-
 ments were Ordinances design'd of God
 for the conveying of *spiritual Blessings* to
 such as do aright partake of them, then they
 could not be Protestants, and yet communi-
 cate in the Sacrament with *Papists*, because
 their way of Administration is not right.
 But, now, to serve a Turn, they can take
 the Sacrament according to the Church of
 England; or, to promote their Cause, go
 to *Miss.*

They are so well pleased with this Piece
 of *Jesuitism*; they do, it's like, find it so
 advantageous for the propagating their No-
 tions, that they can't forbear an exposing the
 opposite Truth held by Protestants as most
 vile and ridiculous. " The Sacraments, ac-
 cording to the Sense of the Orthodox,
 " are a sort of Means which works on our
 " Minds, as *Spells, Charms, and Incanta-*
 " *tions*, (and such like) obtain their pre-
 " tended Effects by a *preternatural Power*,
 " extraordinarily given to them by *God* or
 " by those Spirits who preside over such Af-
 " fairs. Let a Man in *Black* sprinkle you
 " with some of the *Churches Water*, or
 give

Trinitar.
Scheme
Confid. p. 24

“ give you a bit of Bread, or sup of Wine,
“ over which he hath pronounced the won-
“ der-working Words prescribed in Mother
“ Churches Ritual, tho by Nature you are
“ as bad as the Devil, you shall presently be
“ inclin'd to as much Good as will save you
“ from Hell, and qualify you for Heaven :
“ And this no les certainly if you are one
“ of the Elect; for else the Churches *In-*
“ *cantation* produces only a momentary Ef-
“ fect, and a false Appearance of Good: no
“ les certainly I say, than by tying the *Nor-*
“ *man Knot* you may gain the Love of the
“ Person you desire; or by other Devices
“ recorded in the learned Books (so Fools
“ esteem them) of *Magick*, you may cause
“ Hatred, raise Winds, and do a thousand
“ other Feats, which have no more natural
“ or real Agreement with those Causes that
“ are said to produce 'em, than *Faith* and
“ *Obedience* have with a bit of Bread, or
“ with a sprinkling of water. Therefore
“ when St. Augustine defin'd a Sacrament
“ to be the outward visible Sign of an in-
“ ward invisible *Grace* or *Energy*, the good
“ Father should have considered that this is
“ the Definition of a *Charm*, not of a Go-
“ spel Sacrament : for a *Charm* is a bare out-
“ ward visible Sign, that has no natural or
“ real Agreement with the Effect; and if
“ the Effect prove for the Good of the Per-
“ son concerned, it may be called the in-
“ ward invisible *Grace* of such Sign or
“ *Charm*: As when the Effect is to beget
“ Love, or such like. But if the Effect of

" the Charm be hurtful, as to kill, or such like, then it must be called the Energy,
 " not the Grace of the Charm: as that dam-
 " ning Power or Quality which our Oppo-
 " sers impute to the Sacrament of the Sup-
 " per when not receiv'd aright, cannot be
 " called the Grace of that Sacrament, but
 " only the Energy. So that let them turn
 " themselves which way soever they can,
 " they have turn'd the Gospel-Sacraments,
 " as I have laid before, into Charms and
 " Spells.

These are the Evidences of English Socinian Modesty, whose Design of bringing the blessed Sacraments into the greatest Contempt, is manifest. But what I chiefly urge it for, is, that hereby they prepare the Minds of their Followers to prostitute their Consciences to a Compliance with any Religion to the end they may promote their own (if it may be called a) Religion. For when once they have debauch'd their Consciences so thoroughly, that they can take the Sacrament any way without Remorse, as their Notion of it leads Men to do, then may the more learned of their Party profess themselves to be either Papists or Lutherans, Calvinists or Remonstrants, and carry on the Socinian Design either by a clandestine Influation of their Errors, as Blandrata and sundry others of them have done; or, in their Opposition to Socinus, pitch on such Topics as weaken the Truth; which is done by them who assert the Persons in the Blessed Trinity to be Three distinct Essences;

or, represent the *Socinian* Error to be less dangerous than really it is, and the *Socinians* themselves to be Men of greater Learning and Probity than most of them are. Such Methods as these have been taken by *Przippovius*, *Daniel Zutkerus*, *Vorstius*, *Episcopius*, *Curcellaeus*, and many others; and not altogether without Success. However, I must and do acknowledge, *Johannes Nemojevius*, a *Polonian* Knight, and once a Judge, tho a *Socinian*, yet generously opposed *Georgius Schomannus*, who pleaded for this very Principle, about the Use and End of the Lord's Supper. He freely declared, *That in this Point, he differed as much from Socinus as the Heavens are distant from the Earth.* And in Defence of *Vid. Socin.* what he wrote against the *Theses of Emanuel Vega*, he expressed the religious sense ^{Oper. tom. 1. p. 756.} of his Soul, by that Grief he conceived on the spreading of this pernicious Error amongst them. "Do we not read (saith he) "that *Faith* comes by *Hearing*, which is "confirm'd and increased in pious Minds by "the same means? And shall we ascribe less "to the *Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* "than to *Hearing of the Word?* *Socinus* "may perhaps do so; but I suppose no "Men, fearing God, studied in Divinity, "and rightly judging of these things, will "be in this Particular of his Mind. — "There was brought unto me, when sick in "Bed, a Writing from *Schomannus*, which "I did no sooner read, but found my Di- "stemper to increase upon me; so very

" much did it grieve me, to see such Hurt-
" ful Opinions brought into our Church ;
" Opinions, that disquiet the more Infirm,
" and give Great Offence to others who are
" not of our way. — Once more —
" If *Socinus* designs an Answer, I wish he
" would not ; I must confess the Truth, I
" must tell you, that their Writings are
" stuffed which most Offensive Paradoxes, to
" the extreme Grief of my Soul.

Besides, this Disputation between *Niemojevins* and *Schomannus*, makes it plain to me that this Notion about the Sacraments was not started 'till the Year 1588, altho' *Socinus* fixed his dwelling in *Poland* A.D. 1579. That when it did first arise, it startled the more Pious of their own Party; and that from *Niemojevius* his Resolution of Proposing it to the next *Synod* at *Lublin*, it's very likely, the *Generality* were then against it; so far were they from that full Agreement, which our Gentlemen pretend to be almost their Peculiar Property.

SECT.

S E C T. VIII.

An Account of the Italian Combination entered into, to bring the Doctrine of the Trinity into Doubt. The Chief of 'em Assert Three distinct Essences, to introduce the Pre-eminence of the Father, and a Subordination in the Essences of the Son and Holy Spirit. These things cleared out of the Writings of Gentilis and others. The late Assertion of Three Essences the same with that of Gentilis, &c.

Although the English Socinians do, in some Instances, so very much differ from them beyond the Seas, that an exact Description of them cannot be given out of the Writings of the *Fratres Poloni*, yet it must be yielded, that they are nevertheless of the Off-spring of that Faction. For which Reason, I will consider what Combinations have been amongst them, what Shapes they have formed themselves into, and what Principles they advanced, to the end they might subvert the blessed Doctrine of the Trinity.

There was in Italy a strong Combination entered into by near Forty, who form'd themselves into a Society, had their Colleges and

Conferences, where they consulted how to bring the *Doctrines* of the *Trinity*, and *Christ's Satisfaction*, into *Doubt*.

This was, saith *Wissowatius*, about the Year 1546. The chief of their Number, mention'd by *Sandius*, were, *Leonardus Abbas Busalis*, *Lelius Socinus*, *Bernardinus Ochinus*, *Nicholaus Paruta*, *Valentinus Gentilis*, *Julius Trevisanus*, *Franciscus de Ruego*, *Jacobus de Chiari*, *Franciscus Niger*, *Darius Socinus*, *Paulus Alciatus*, &c. who continued together till their Design took Air: at which time they being severely prosecuted, some of 'em went into *Helvetia*, others into *France*, *Britain*, *Holland*, *Germany*, and *Poland*, and some into the *Turkish Territories*, where they had their Liberty; only *Julius Trevisanus* and *Franciscus de Ruego* were taken and executed: and *Jacobus de Chiari*, as *Lubienescius* saith, died a natural Death.

These Men, where ever they went, took all Occasions to instil their Errors; which they did, by offering Objections against the *Truth*, that, as was pretended, they might be the more firmly established in the Faith, and be more able to defend it. And having scar'd their Consciences with fraudulent *subscriptions*, and *Perjury*, they formed themselves into sundry *Shapes*, not scrupling to subscribe and swear to what they neither Believed nor Intended: nor did they care what Methods they used, might they thereby subvert the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity* and *Christ's Satisfaction*.

That

Narrat.
Compend.
Biblioth.
Anitritin.
p. 18.

That they were set at work by the Papists is no way improbable; especially, if we consider how at Lyons the Papists discharged *Valentinus Gentilis* so soon as they understood his Design was to oppose *Calvin*; and how safely *Servetus*, notwithstanding his Blasphemies, lived amongst them.

Lubien. Histor. Reformationis Polon. I. 2.

c. 5. p. 106.
G.

The Principle which at first they advanced, as what was most likely to bring the Doctrinae of the Trinity into contempt, was their turning the Three Persons into Three distinct Essences, and their appropriating a peculiar Preheminence to the Father.

Servetus, who is by *Stanislaus Lubieniecius*, in his *History of the Polish Reformation*, highly applauded for his Diligence in Consulting the *Alcoran of Mahomet*, out of which he extracted the Opinions he held about the Trinity, having by his Sufferings gotten a Reputation, it became the Province of *Valentinus Gentilis*, and *Alciatus*, after the Dispersion of these designing Incendiaries, to go to Geneva, and try what they could do towards carrying on that Work, which *Servetus* had with so much Labour and Travail begun. And that their Success might be the greater, 'twas the Care of *Gentilis* to clear him self as much as possibly he could, from the Charge of being a Favourer either of *Arius* or *Servetus*; and therefore pretends a Zeal for the True Trinity, as he expresses it in a Letter to *Copus*, *Raymundus*, and *Henocns*, learned Ministers in Geneva, explaining his Notion thus. "The Father is that one

Calv. Hist.
Theol. pag. 660. 662.

"only Essence, that is from it self. The
 "word is the Brightness of the Glory of
 "God, the express Image of his Substance,
 "and in this respect distinct from the Fa-
 "ther, who is (as Christ himself saith)
 "the only True God, the Essentiator, that
 "is, the Informator Individuorum. The
 "word is the Son, and also the True God,
 "and yet not Two Gods, but one and the
 "same God. Or, as Aretius, in his Brief
 Account of Valentinus Gentilis: "A True
 "Trinity ought to consist of Three eternal
 "distinct Spirits, differing from each other
 "essentially, rather than personally. The
 Father he stiles ~~anūdū~~ God of himself,
 as he is more eminently, truly, and proper-
 ly God: But the Essence of the Son is not
 (saith he) of himself, but an Essentiatum,
 derived from the Essence of the Father, and
 is a Secondary God.

*Deus post Christum mani-
 festatum, in tres Essentias
 Divisus, maneat tamen U-
 nus Deus: quia hæc Dis-
 pensatio nihil in eo mutat.*
Tract. Theol. p. 657.

And what faith Servetus
 of this Notion? Calvin tells
 us. That he holds the Deity
 to be divided into Three Es-
 sences, and yet there is but
 One God. For the Socinians

greater Satisfaction, I will

Hist. Refor. give Servetus his Sense, out of a Discourse
Polon. l. 2. he delivered some time before his Execu-
c. 5. p. 99, tion, as published by Lubeniſcius, from the
&c.

Autograph; In which he having opposed
 the Opinion of them who affirm Three sub-
 stantial Persons to be in God, by Nature
 equal to one another, which he looks upon
 to be Blasphemy, and an execrable Impiety,

he

he freely gives us his own Sentiments, to this effect : “ 1. That the Name [*God*] is “ Appellative, signifying one to whom all “ *Power, Dominion, and Superiority* doth “ properly belong, who is above all, the “ chief of all, King of Kings, and Lord “ of Lords, from whom all things are, and “ on whom they depend. The Name [*God*] “ taken less properly, may be applied to “ such Creatures as have *Power* and *Supe-* “ *riority* given them of God, as *Moses* and “ *Cyrus* had, &c. who were Gods not by “ *Nature* but *Grace*. — 2. That the Lord “ Jesus Christ is called *the True Son of* “ *God*; and *God*, because he received his “ *Deity* from God the Father, is *True God* “ of *True God*: God of all Creatures; not “ God of the Father, who subjects all things “ to him. — Moreover, the Father “ himself, who alone is by Nature *God*, “ from himself, is *Lord and God of the* “ *Son*, as the *Son* himself expresseth it, “ *John 14. 28* — The *Son* is full of “ the *Deity*, and yet the *Superiority* the “ Father hath over the *Son* remains; “ whence, tho the *Son* is made to us by the “ Father, *Lord and God and our Head*, yet “ the Father is *God and Head of the Son*, “ and the *Son* as our *God and Head* recog- “ nizeth the *Deity and Superiority* of the “ *Father* over him. — See then, how “ the *Scriptures* do constantly distinguish “ between *God* and the *Son of God*! If we “ diligently search, we shall find, that ex- “ cepting in three or four places, the *Scri-* “ ptures

" ptures do simply and absolutely call the
 " Father God, and Jesus, his Christ, and
 " Son. —— The Divinity of the Son dif-
 fers from that of other Gods : He is the
 " True, Natural, and in a proper Sense,
 " the Son of God ; we the Adoptive Sons
 " of God : To him the Deity was given
 " without measure, to us in measure. The
 " Deity, Power, and Glory of the Son, is
 " adequate to that of the Father, and equal
 " with it ; but received from the Father,
 " not equal with respect to the Father, but
 " equal with the Father with respect to the
 " Creatures : This Equality the Son will
 " not abuse by turning it into Tyranny or
 " Rapine, Philip. 2.

The Agreement then, between *Valentimus Gentilis* and *Servetus*, lies in these Points : They both affirm *Three distinct Essences* to be in the *Trinity*; that the Father only is *uni-∞*; that the Essence of the Son is not from it self, but from the Father's; that there is but one most *High God*: so that although *Gentilis* would cover himself under a *Vizor*, that it might not appear, he was an Embracer of *Servetus's Errors*, and therefore took a different way to explain himself; yet it's plain enough, that their Notions, for substance, were the same: and notwithstanding their pretended Zeal for the Unity of God, they were a sort of *Tritheists*.

However, it must be acknowledged, that their designed Obscurity was such, that it's not easy to understand what Principles *Ser-*

vetus

vetus would substitute instead of a *Trinity* of *Persons* in the God-head; only, they generally pleaded for the *Preeminence* and *Superiority* of the Father's Essence above the Son's, as it had a necessary Tendency towards the Subversion of the *Trinity*: and to this very end, *Servetus*, *Valentinus Gentilis*, and *Genesius a Polonian* Tri-theist, against whom *Zancky* wrote, urged it.

This *Genesius*, as *Sandius* observes, was *Biblioth.* the first that oppugned the Doctrine of the *Antitrib.* *Trinity* in *Poland*; and as *Wissowatius*, ^{P. 41.} he asserted the *Preeminence* of the Deity of *Narrat.* the Father above that of the Son, for the *Compend.* most part according to the *Placita* of *Servetus* and *Gentilis*: *Stoinius*, in his *Epitome*, affirms the same of *Genesius*, and so doth *Lubieniescius*, adding, that in a Synod held *Ann. 1556* he owned it: and out of *Simler*, ^{Hist. Ref.} *Lubieniescius* tells us, That as in *Trajanil-* ^{Pol. l. 2. c. 6.} *vania*, *Franciscus Davidis* was *Servetus* ^{P. III. 116} *Illustratus*, so *Genesius* was in *Poland*. *Kazanovius* and *Farnovius* were of the same Mind with *Genesius*.

But, that they might be the more successful, they took another Method to introduce *Three Essences* into the *Trinity*, still finding that to be the most likely way to expose the Faith of the Orthodox touching this blessed Doctrine which was thus managed.

Stankarus, perhaps of the same Faction with *Gentilis*, and his Disciples, started a peculiar Notion about Christ's *Mediatorship*,

ship, affirming, "That the Word [God] in Scripture signified *Trinity*; that when twas said, *There is one God*, the Meaning is, there is *Unus Deus Trinitas*: for which Reason, if Christ be Mediator, as *God*, the *Trinity* (saith he) must be the Mediator, or Christ must be *God* of a *distinct Essence* from the Father, and inferior to him. And the Orthodox believing Christ to be Mediator, as *God-Man*, were accused by *Stankarus* for being *Arians*.

This Notion occasion'd Great Distractiōns amongst the reformed in *Poland*, as appears from what some of 'em wrote to *Calvin*, craving his Thoughts of it; and from what *Felix Cruciger*, *Gregorius Pauli*, *Stanislaus Latomirski*, *Paulus Gilovius*, *Martinus Crovitius*, *Franciscus Lismannus*, and Sundry others, who met in a Synod at *Pinczow* did Anno 1562. send to the Professors of Divinity, and Pastors of the Church at *Argentine*, where was a particular Account of *Stankarus* his Errors with a Confession of the True Faith; But as (*Calvin* feared) *Blandrata*, and his Partizans, pretending a Great Zeal for the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, did, in a seeming Opposition to *Stankarus*, own the Consequences he had fastned on the Doctrine embraced by the Orthodox, as what did naturally flow from Christ's being *Mediator*, as *God-Man*; and a Table was soon published, in which they

Tabulam nuper in Polonia Editam, quæ *Christum & Spiritum Sanctum* alias a *Patre Deo* facit, non sine macroe inspexi. Calv. Tract. Theol. p. 683.

de-

declared Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost, to be *Two Gods*, distinct from the *Father*; and that the *Three Persons* were *Three distinct Essences*.

This Table, as *Calvin* apprehended, was written by *Blandrata*; but *Sandius* faith, that *Gregorius Pauli*, in an Epistle to the *Tigurine Ministers*, owns himself to be the Author of it. For tho' *Gregorius Pauli*, *Latomirski*, *Lismaninus*, and many others subscribed a found Confession of Faith in Opposition to the Errour of *Stankarus*, yet did they fall in with *Blandrata*, and tho' *Calvin* sent them an *Admonition*, in which he dehortet them against taking the *Three Persons* to be *Three Essences*, least they should Frame to themselves *Three Gods*: yet it was, faith *Beza*, to very little purpose: For the *Polonian Ministers*, being bewitch'd with *Blandrata's Hypocrisies*, were generally ensnared to a Closure with his Errors. And *Blandrata* himself Observing how efficaciously this Engine wrought, call'd in the Help of *Valen-te Dei ver-tinus Gentilis*, and *Petrus Statorius*, who with *Matthaeus Gribaldus*, and others, were indefatigable in their Labours to establish a sort of *Tritheism*, as the most Effectual Means to Introduce their *Samosatenian Heresies*: And their Success this way was Answerable to their Industry and Expectations; for in a little time, to the Admirition of the Orthodox in other Parts of *Europe*, many of the Reformed in *Poland* were insnared into a Closure with *Socinianism*. Epist. 81.
p. 363.
*An docuit
bum multi-
plicari posse
Dei Essen-
tiam. Epist.
Bez.ad Pet.*

That

Plures De-
os, si non
verbo, Re-
tanent ipsa
profidentes,
Epist. 19.
p. 129. Vid.
Epist. 81.
P. 361, &c.

That their first Effort against the Trinity was a setting up of Tritheism; not avowedly, but Clandestinely, is Affirmed by Beza. "In the beginning, (saith he) they were, for the most part, Tritheists, transforming the Three Persons into so many Essences; Then did they Appropri-
 ate the Appellation of the One True God unto the Father, to whom they also ascribed an Hyperoche, a Preeminance, or Superiority above the Son. This was the Principle, which at first they advanced, as most likely to bring the Blessed Trinity of Persons in one undivided Essence, into contempt. Against which, Calvin, Zanchy, and the Reformed, did set themselves, as against a most Fornicous, and Hurtful Heresy, as undoubtedly it is; For, it being affirm'd, that every Person hath a Peculiar Substance of his Own, there must be as many Substances or Essences, as there are Persons, which being of the same Nature, must be as many Gods as they are Persons; which is Tritheism. Three Distinct Infinite substances, or Three Eternal Spirits, cannot be less than Three Gods.

But, tho' its affirmed " (1) That it is gross Sabellianism to say, That there are not Three Personal Minds or Spirits, or Substances. (2) That a distinct Substantial Person, must have a distinct substance of his own; Proper and Peculiar to his own Person; yet if it be owned, that there are not Three Gods, but One God, or One Divinity which is intirely and inseparably

" bly in Three distinct Persons, or Minds ;
" it cannot be Heresie : As a very Learned Person avers, because in this case (saith he) the Fundamental Article is Believed, and the Error is only a *Mistake* in the *Explanation*.

However, the Doctrine of Three Distinct Substances hath been, not only Learnedly as well as sharply charged with *Tritheism*; but Condemned for being *Impious* and *Heretical*. I will therefore, it lying so much in my way, venture, humbly to Offer what inclines me to Conclude, that this turning the *Three Persons* into *Three Essences* is Heretical. For tho I am far from Hereticating every one that differs from me in *Matters of Moment*; or from making every Erroneous Explication of a Fundamental Article to be Heresie; yet I am perswaded, that the Doctrine of the Trinity of Persons in one undivided Essence is of such a Nature; that many, in their explicating it, have fall'n into divers Heresies; and that thus it is in the Present Case.

The Doctrine condemned for Heretical is a makeing the *Persons* in the Blessed Trinity to be *Three Distinct Substances*, or *Individual Natures*; which is as Direct a Contradiction to the *One Intire, and Indivisible Nature of God*, as can be. Three Individual Essences are as much Opposed to one Individual Essence, as Three Persons are to one Person; and Three Persons may be as well *One Person*, as three Individual Essences be one *Individual Essence*.

The

The Author therefore of this Notion cannot, in Reason, be supposed to Believe these Contradictory Propositions to be both true: and being so vehement in his Asserting Three Individual Natures as to make the Denial thereof to be *Heresie* and *Nonsense*, we must be so Civil to him, as to suppose, that he doth not Believe the Essence of God to be one Intire Indivisible Essence; which I do the more readily suppose, because it's so Common for *Tritheists* to do so.

It is owned, "That *Photius* grants that
 "Conon, and his Followers, held a *Consu-*
Phot. Bibl. Cod. 24.
stancial Trinity, and the Unity of the
 "God-head; and so far were Orthodox;
 "but then adds, they were far from it, when
 "they Asserted *Proper* and *Peculiar Sub-*
 "stances to Each Person."

I have not that *Bibliotheca* by me, but *Sicarius*, in his Account of the *Tritheists*, saith, they held Three Substances and Natures in all things alike, and yet would by no means own Three Divinities or Three Gods; and refers to the *Bibliotheca Photij*, where it's thus [vid. *Severus* "and *Theodosius*.] I speake many things ex-
 "cellently well; as, that there was a Con-
 "substantial Trinity, of the same Nature;
 "and but one God, one Divinity; BA-
 "SINGER'S REPORT, &c. But they Blas-
 "phemed, when they said, the Father, the
 "Son and the Holy Ghost, had their Pro-
 "per NATURE, and Divinities, or Particu-
 "lar Substances, and so contradicted them-
 "selves as well as the Truth, &c. So that
 "their

Cod. 24.
P. 16.

their asserting the Consubstantiality of the Trinity, and it's being of the same Nature, could not secure their making the Three Persons three Distinct Substances, from being *Blasphemy*.

But what I mostly Press, is this Consideration; that if the contradictory Affirmation of three Individual Essences being but one Individual Essence, will clear the Notion from being Heresie, then *Valentinus Gentilis*, *Lismaninus*, *Blandrata*, and the many other Propagators of the *Socinian Abominations*, must be also for the same reason cleared from Heresie.

I will begin with *Gentilis*, who held, *Lubien. Hist. sive Ref. l.* that there were three distinct Eternal Spirits or Minds in the Trinity; that the Son was *2. c. 5. p. Begotten from Eternity [Ante Secula in 107.*

Latitudine Aeternitatis,] Thus much *Lubieniescius*: And *Gentilis* himself, in his Epistle to the Ministers at *Geneva*, was Positive, "that the Father only is true God, "and the Son also true God; and yet not *Tract. Theol.* "Two but One and the same God, because *p. 660,* *661.*" *Christ* hath one and the same Essence "with the Father, and therefore (faith he) "I am neither *Arian* nor *Servetian*, *Lismaninus*, and *Blandrata* held the same for Substance with *Gentilis*. To clear thus much, I must Observe what *Lubieniescius* reports of *Lelius Socinus*, who was one of the forty *Italian Combinators*; It is to this Effect, "Lelius Socinus (faith he) travelled first "into *Helvetia*, then into *Italy*, *Britain*, "and *Germany*; and about the year 1551. " he

" he got into *Poland*; from whence after he
 " had instill'd his Errors into the Hearts of
 " *Lismaninus*, and many others, he went
 " into *Moravia*, and then returned to *Hel-*
 " *vetia*. That in *Moravia*, *Paruta*, *Gen-*
tilis, *Darius*, and *Alciatus*, of the same
 Combination with *Lælius*, did their Part to
 spread their Notions, sending into *Poland*
 their *Theses* about the Trinity, and doubtful
 Phrases in the Holy Scriptures.

Ubi sup. l. 3.
c. i.

There were near twenty *Theses* about the *Trinity*, which they did put into the hands of their Friend *Prosper Provana*, who committed them to the Care of *Eudzinus*. He no sooner Read 'em, but gave them unto *Johannes Pustelnecius* from whom *Stanislaus Lutomirskius* got a *Copy*, which being communicated to sundry others, the Controversie about the *Trinity* had there its Rise; some firmly adhering to the *Faith*, received from the Lord Christ and his Apostles; others, ensnared by the Objections raised against it by the *Italian Combinators*, vehemently opposed the Truth: not that they did it openly, but (as our *Vindicated Author*) displeased with the Old, offered their New Explications, in the very same manner He hath done. Amongst others, *Lismaninus* and *Blandrata* were very active.

Lismaninus, who was first infected by the Endeavours of *Letus Socinus*, and confirm'd in his Heresies by *George Blandrata*, falling into Suspicion, takes Heart, and in a Letter to *Stanislaus Ivanus Karninscius*, boldly defends *Blandrata*. But, that he might do

do his part to remove all grounds of jealousie touching his Orthodoxy, he Prefaces his Epistle with a short Prayer to God the Father, from whom *are all things*, through the *Lord Christ*, by whom *are all things*, *Consubstantial and Co-eternal with the Father* and the *Holy Ghost*. And, in the Epistle it self, he gives a summary of his own Faith, and of the Faith of them who dwelt at *Pinczow*, in these words. “ We Believe in “ God the Father, from whom are all things, “ who is Infinite without beginning, and “ from whom, not only all Creatures are, “ but also the *Divinity* and Bonity of the “ Son and Holy Ghost; as *Nazianzen* “ teacheth in his *Apologie*.

“ We Believe also in our *Lord Jesus Christ*, the Son of God, who is the *In-carnate word, God-man, God of God, Light of Light, True God of True God, Consubstantial, Co-eternal, and Co-equal in Essence, or Nature, Power, Glory, Authority, and Honour, with the Father.*

“ And,

“ We Believe in the *Holy Ghost* the True God of the Father and the Son; or, as the *Greek Doctors* teach, in an unutterable manner, from Eternity, proceeding from the Father by the Son, Consubstantial, Co-eternal, and Co-equal with the Father and the Son, in his Essence, Power, Majesty, Glory, Authority, and Honour.

Blandrata in a Synod at *Xiansia*, Anno Dom. 1562, declared his Belief, “ In one Lubien.
God the Father, in one Lord Jesus Christ Hift. Ref.
Pol. l. 2.

" his Son, and in one Holy Ghost; each of
 " which is Essentially God: A *Plurality*
 " of Gods I Abhor (saith he) for with us
 " there is but *One* God only, whose Essence
 " is Indivisible: I do confess that there are
 " Three distinct Hypostases; that the Deity
 " of Christ, and his Generation, is Eternal;
 " and, that the Holy Ghost is True and
 " Eternal God, proceeding from both.

In these Confessions, there is the Denial
 of a *Plurality* of Gods and a Profession,
 that the Son, and Holy Spirit are of the same
 Essence, Consubstantial, Co-eternal, Co-equal
 with the Father; in words, as full as
 its Possible for the *Vindicated Author*, (who
 holds the Persons of the Trinity to be Three
 distinct Essences) to express it; Howbeit
 these Men were justly Charged with the
Tritheistical Heresie. Peter *Martyr*, as
Lubienescius reports, doth in a Letter *An-*

Hist. Ref. no Dom. 1558, speak of *Blandrata's* bring-
Pol. l. 2. ing into the Deity a Certain kind of *Mo-*
c. 6. p. 126. *narchy*, denying the *Essence* of the Father
 and the Son to be the same, from whence a
 a *Plurality* of Gods, doth follow, which
 thing, as he was told, *Gribaldus*, did in ex-
 press words *Aisert*. In like manner *Lubieni-*
escius himself tells us, " That *Lismaninus*,
 " and *Blandrata*, Agreed in this, that un-
 " less it be settled, that God, who in the
 " Holy Scriptures, is called the *Father* of
 " Jesus Christ, is *the most High God*, no fa-
 " tisfying Answer can be made to *Stane-*
 " *rns*; nor can that *Worship*, which is due
 " unto the *most High God*, be given him,
 " for

"for Christ himself doth say, my Father
"is Greater than I.

These Men, and their Followers, notwithstanding these Confessions, were so far from believing the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, to be Coessential, Coeternal, and Coequal, that as *Gentilis* made the Father to be the *Essentiator*, and the Son and Spirit to be the *Essentiati*; so these were Positive; that there was a *Preheminence* of *Causality* in the Father above the Son and Holy Ghost; that the Essence of the Son and Holy Spirit was not *Unoriginated, Uncause*d, and from it self only; but from the *Es*sence of the Father, that is to say, the Father was the *Essentiator*, and the Son and Spirit the *Essentiati*; and making the Essence of the Son, and Spirit so very distinct from the Essence of the Father they were for *three Essences* in the Trinity; *Three di*stinct *Essences*, and therefore were call'd *Trideitæ*, which is not only the Observation of *Beza*, but the Confession of *Lubieniescius*, who saith, " That they were injuriously by " the Adversary called *Trideitæ*, tho' nothing more manifest than that they being the Worshippers of God the Father by Jesus Christ the only mediator, were therefore in *Transilvania*, called *Unitarians*.

The Notion then of *Gentilis Lismanni*nus and *Blandratæ* was, that the Son and Holy Ghost were Consubstantial, Coequal and Coeternal in Essence with the Father; they were of one, and the same Nature; and yet three Infinite, and Eternal distinct

Essences, and Spirits; which is the same for substance with what our *Vindicated Author* so Vehemently Contends for; whence I argue, If our Authors Asserting one Individual Essence, or Deity will secure his Three Infinite Essences, or Minds from Heresie, it must also clear *Gentilis*, *Lismanus*, *Blandrata* and their disciples; ay *Severus*, and *Theodosius* too, from the same Charge: But if it won't clear them from being Heretical, it cannot sufficiently Vindicate *Him*.

But this *Tritheism* is not only, as I have already intimated, an Heresie; But the same, that the *Italian Hereticks* pitched on to Introduce their *Samosatenianism*; and whoever will make a close search, will see, that it hath a Tendency thereunto, not only as hereby a Trinity of Persons is made a Trinity of Gods, to the setting the Minds of many against the Truth it self; but as this their Principle leads its Embracers to take into their Faith, the several Consequences, which *Naturally*, and *Necessarily* flow from it. For, Answerable to the various Capacities, Inclinations, and Interests of them, who will have it that the Persons in the Trinity are three distinct *Essences*, Sundry Errors do arise. But ~~rate to infuse upon them~~, to escape the Blasphemous Absurdities, which flow from their asserting *Three distinct Infinite Essences*, *Spirits*, or *Minds*. As for instance, their making them Three distinct Infinite Co-equal Gods; they ascribed unto the Father an *Hyperoche*, a *Preheminence* and *Superiority*

ority above the Son, and Holy Ghost. But then the *Inequality*, which did immediately follow from the *Preheminence*, and *Superiority*, assigned to the Father being such, as was in every Bodies Judgment, inconsistent with the Sons and Holy Ghosts being *Consubstantial* and *Co-equal* with the Father they were at a loss how to *Explain* themselves. An Inequality, as to the *OEconomy*, *Dispensation*, and *Office*, they look'd on as insufficient. The *Arians* and *Samosatenians* therefore say, it must be an Inequality of Essence. But this being so gross a Contradiction to the Son's and Holy Ghost's being of the *same Nature*, and *Co-equal* with the Father, *Servetus*, *Gentilis*, with the *Pinczovians*, would not at first expressly allow of more than an Inequality as a *Cause* or *Principle*; making the Essence of the Father to be the *Principle* or *Cause* of the Essence of the Son and Holy Ghost; affirming, that tho' the Essence of the Father was *Unoriginated*, and *from it self*; yet so was not the Essence of the Son, and Holy Ghost: These Essences, they said, were *Cau-sed*; the one by an Eternal Generation from the Father, the other thro' an ineffable Pro-cession from the Father, by the Son. Thus by a deriving distinct Essences from the Essence of the Father, they rejected the *Autobterity* of the Son and Spirit, and with their *Causalities* brought in such dependencies of the Son and Spirit on the Father as interfered with a being absolutely Infinite in every Perfection; and thus, in a more Artificial manner, they

ran the same length with the *Arian* and *Socinian* as to the Inequality; For that Essence which is not *of it self* is not, cannot be, in a *strict Proper Sence*, God; for the Essence of God is only from it self, uncaused, unoriginated; an Essence that hath a beginning, and is caused, cannot be Absolutely Eternal; for what is Absolutely Eternal, never had a beginning, never was caused, never receiv'd its *Essence* from another.

There is a Great difference between *Caus-ing a Distinct Essence*, and a *communicating* the same Individual *Essence* to another; for though the causing another necessarily implies that the *Caused Essence* was from another, a communicating it doth not so. The Father's communicating his own *Essence* unto the Son, doth not argue the Son's *Essence* is from another, for 'tis still the same it was before it was communicated. But the Father's *causing* an *Essence* distinct from his own, imports Imperfection in the *Caused Essence*, even the want of a truly *proper* and *absolute* Eternity and Independence, and necessarily infers an Inequality of *Essence*, which is the thing the *Arians* and *Samosatenians* saw and asserted, and the *Pinczovians* intended; who, as they observ'd their Disciples prepared to embrace this Error, insinuated it.

Epist. 81.
p. 364,
4^o.

This appears from *Blandrata's* Endeavour, in an Epistle which *Beza* had of his, to perswade *Gregorius Pauli*, a *Tritheist*, to close with the Opinions of *Samosatenus*, and from what *Petrus Statorius*, a Companion

panion of *Blandrata*, when he dwelt at *Pinczow* [from which Place the *Tritheists* had their Name of *Pinczovians*, with whom *Franciscus Lijmaninus*, *Martin Crovicius*, *Schomannus*, *Gregorius Pauli*, *Erelius*, *Biblioth.* *Triceffius*, and (as *Sandius observes*) *Ochinius*, *Stancarus*, *Alciatus*, &c, had their p. 48.

Habitations] did offer in a Synod at *Pinczow*, about the Insufficiency of the Answer which a Synod, held in the same place, did some time before give unto *Remianus Chelmius* about what he wrote against the Invocation of the Holy Ghost. The Story is thus :

Remianus Chelmius sent to a Synod held at *Pinczow* the 12th of November An. 1559, a Letter, in which several things were objected against the *Invocation of the Holy Ghost*. *Peter Statorius*, who, as *Sandius Biblioth.* suggests, instilled this Opinion into *Chelmius*, doth with *Gregorius Pauli* and others p. 48.

suggests, instilled this Opinion into *Chelmius*, doth with *Gregorius Pauli* and others move, that the Doctrine of the *Trinity* might be diligently examined, and tryed by the Holy Scriptures. An Answer is sent from this Synod unto *Chelmius*. But *Statorius*, in a Synod held at the same place November the 19th 1561. declared, that *Chelmius* was not satisfied with the Answer sent unto him. The Synod therefore obliged him to return a fuller one, which he did, but in such a manner, that no one could tell what it was he himself held. *Stoinius*, who was Grandson to *Statorius*, represents matters of Fact thus. "In this Synod Anno 1561, *Statorius* was directed to write an Answer unto *Chelmski*, which he did, "but

Epit. Hist.

Orig. Unit.

in Pol.

"but so, that it did not appear what he
 "himself believed of it : He only said, that
 "Blandrata was Represented by *Calvin* as
 "one who had drank in the Poyson of the
 "Servetian Impiety. As for the Opinion
 "which he proposed to the *Synod*, 'twas ac-
 "ceptable to all, but Question'd by him,
 "whether the Belief, that the *Father*
 "was one *Unbegotten*, and the *Son Begot-*
 "ten, did not infer a *Plurality of Gods*.
 "But all they (they are *Statorius* his
 "own Words) that dwell with Blandrata
 "are suspected for holding some *Heresies*.
 "But if they are *Hetericks*, who according
 "to the *Holy Scriptures* Believe the *Fa-*
 "ther, Son and *Holy Ghost*, I do chear-
 "fully (faith he) acknowledge my self to
 "be of that Number, &c.

Lubieniescius, passing by what *Regen-*
volscius in his *History of the Slavonian*
Churches faith of *Statorius*, doth out of
Budzinius tell us, "That *Statorius* succeed-
 "ing *Paulus Orficius* in the Government
 "of the School at *Pincow*, Professed the
 "True Faith, affirming that *The Invocation*
 "on of the *Holy Ghost* is *Idolatry*; That
 "there is not one Text in the *Holy Scrip-*
 "ture either for the *Deity*, or *Invocation*,
 "or *Adoration* of the *Holy Spirit*, or for
 "Faith in him. That the *Holy Ghost* is
 "not the *third Person* of the *Deity*, nor
 "God, but the Power and Gift of God.

Lubien.
Hist. l. 2.
c. 8. p. 149.

On this occasion there arose several Dis-
 putes amongst the Learned, at which time
Statorius persuaded many to embrace this
 Opinion;

Opinion : notwithstanding which, and altho *Alexius Rodecius* told *Statorius* to his Face, that he Learned this Principle from him ; yet did he in the Year 1567, openly deny it, declaring, that *the Spirit is God*, and *to be worshipped as God* ; and *whoever taught otherwise was of his Father the Devil* : for which Reason, *Budzinius* look'd on him as a *Proteus*, forsaken of the Holy Spirit. And *Orphinovius* faith, *God Entrusted him with Sundry Talents, which he did not Employ in defence of the Truth* ; but the *Trinitarians* being the stronger Party, he did, at last, turn unto them.

Thus these *Pinczovians*, vid. *Lismani-nus*, *Gregorius Pauli*, *Ochinus*, *Statorius*, *Stancarus*, *Alciatus*, &c. their *Partizans*, did not only set up *Tritheism* with a Design to bring in the *Samosatenian Heresie*, but formed themselves into sundry Shapes, and were unwearied in their Attempts, first to turn the *Three Persons* into *Three distinct Essences*, insinuate an *Inequality* amongst them, ascribing to the Father a *Prehemi-nence*, and then bring the Deity of the Holy Spirit into Doubt, and make the Lord Christ a *subordinate God* ; and thus establish their *Socinianism*.

That Learned Doctor therefore, who hath confuted this *Pinczovian Heresie* of *Three distinct Essences in the Trinity*, deserves greatly from the Church of God ; For, by turning his Strength against the Notion of *Three distinct Infinite Essences, Substan-ces, Spirits, or Minds* he hath taken an Effectual

Effectual Course to break those *Socinian* Measures which were most likely to expose the blessed Trinity, and prepare the Minds of many to take in their *Unitarianism*, or rather *Bideism*. And they who have condemned the Assertion of *Three distinct Essences*, or *Minds*, for *Heretical*, have done honourably to their Eternal Praise.

When the old *Socinian Game* is Playing over again, and some who pretend a *Zeal* for the *Trinity* walk in the same Path, and plead for *Three distinct Essences*, as the *Italian Hereticks* heretofore did, it is time for the Orthodox to look to themselves: They cannot be too cautious in a matter of such Consequence; and what Persons soever are industrious in their Endeavours to propagate this Doctrine of *Three Infinite Minds*, or *Spirits*, are justly suspected: Especially since it is in a case where *Solemn Protestations*, *Sacred Subscriptions*, and *Oaths*, have been used only as a *Blind* to delude the Orthodox.

Respond. ad

Comp. Mat.

Stadi. Seg.

164.

Conradus Vorstius made many a Protestation of his Orthodoxy in this very Point, expressly declaring, that he was neither *Arian* nor *Socinian*. “ I can (faith he) with a good Conscience solemnly *Testify*, and *Declare*, as in Presence of God and Men, “ that I have not design’d the promoting either *Socinianism* or *Arianism*, &c. And in his Preface to this answer he sets down a *Confession* of his *Faith*; and in the close of what he had said of the Trinity he Declares, “ That the *Faith* of the Holy

“ Tri-

" Trinity, of the Person and Office of our
" Lord Jesus Christ, he will by the Grace
" of God Constantly and Religiously adhere
" unto, for which reason (he adds) I cannot,
" without manifest Injury, be condemned for
" holding either the *Arian, Samosatenian,*
" or any other such Heresie.

Howbeit he is Positive, " That the Three
" Persons are Three distinct Real *Entia*, or
" *Beings*, and that it is a Contradiction,
" that any thing should truly Exist that had
" not its Proper *Essence*. It is therefore
" manifest, (saith he) that in the Trinity
" there are distinct Things; That no one
" can deny thus much, unless he doth with
" *Praxea* and *Sabellius* hold only *Three*
" *Names*, or *Respects* and *Offices*, &c. (as
" we observed.) Every Being hath a cer-
" tain peculiar *Essence*; and it undoubtedly *Vorſt. Apol.*
" follows that each Person hath a Certain *Exeg. c. 9.*
" Proper *Essence* of his own: So *Vorſtius*, p. 87, 38.
who nevertheless expressly afferts, that the *Vorſt. de*
Subſtance of God, is but one Numerical or *Deo vid.*
Individual Subſtance; That he is so one, *Not. ad*
as to be an *Individual*, that cannot be *Di-* *dispns. 3.*
vided either into Species or Parts. *p. 208,*
220, 221.

This was *Vorſtius* his Notion; which, notwithstanding his Solemn Proteftations of adhering unto the Orthodox Faith, he did his uttermost to propagate; he himself, as I have already proved, in the 70th. Page of this Discourse, Living, and Dying an *An- tritrituritarian*. And as it was thus with him, so it may be now with others: They may Profess to Believe one Divinity, which is Intirely

Intirely and Inseparably in Three distinct Persons or Minds, and hold these Three Persons to be Three distinct Essences with a design to introduce *Socinianism*. For, from what I have said it's clear, that the *Italian Consult* Professed to Believe there was but *One God*, and Pitched on the Doctrine of *Three distinct Essences*, that from thence they might introduce an *Inequality of Essences*, assign a *Preheminence* and Superiority to the Essence of the Father, and make the Son but a *Subordinate God*; which is the Point the *Socinians* would be at.

These are some of the Methods which the *Foreign Socinians* have taken to expose the Trinity and Propagate their Heresies; and whoever will consult the Writings of our *English Gentlemen*, who are their *Offspring*, will see, that there are a Set of Men amongst us, who have, in Imitation of the *Italian Hereticks*, entered into a Combination to bring into contempt the same Blessed Truths, after the same manner their Predecessors have done.

SECT.

S E C T. IX.

The Socinian Trinity proposed: Their Explications of it mysterious. They affirm the Holy Ghost to be Eternal, and yet not God, nor a Creature. That Jesus Christ is but a Creature, and yet God. That the Father is the most High God, but not Infinite, Immense, or Omnipotent.

BY what hath been hitherto asserted of the English Socinians, it is apparent, that whatever their Religion is, they are not prepar'd, as yet, for that Concord, as to be able to Compose, and Publish an Exact Scheme of it; but do they bend their Strength rather to tear up old Foundations, covering themselves in such a manner under Generals, that it's Impossible to find out what they would in Particular be at. And, that they may strew the way for the most easy making Proselytes, they apply themselves to such Methods, as I have in the foregoing Sections observed: And whereas the different Explications given of the *Trinity* by some Orthodox Divines, are made by them the Matter of so much Triumph, I will, as an agreeable Return, shew how Mysterious themselves are in Explaining their *Trinity*.

It must be acknowledged, that about the Year 1562. these Hereticks did their uttermost to engage the Ministers to abstain from *Philosophical Terms*, or *Humane Forms of Speech*. And, as *Stoinius* observes, it was this Year concluded in a Synod at *Pinczow*, "that the Ministers do not use any "Philosophical Modes of Speech about the "Trinity, Essence, Generation, or Mode of "Proceeding; but that every one should "Confine himself to the *Terms* used in the "Writings of the Prophets, and *Apostles*; "and in the *Apostles Creed*. But notwithstanding this Decree *Sarnicius* contended earnestly against *Gregorius Pauli*, for their use; on which occasion, *Stanislaus Szafarnicus* did, in a Synod met the same Year at *Rogow*, labour to compose the Differences between them, but in vain; only 'twas then Decreed, that they should tolerate one another, and abstain from such Forms as are unscriptural.

Hist. Ref.
Pol. l. 3.
c. i. p. 167.

But, saith *Lubieniescius*, in June the Year following, viz., 1563. another Synod met, which wrote unto Prince *Radzivil*, "That altho they could not because of some weak Brethren, wholly suppress the use of the Word *Trinity*; yet they had in a great measure purged it from the present Abuse. And in the Year 1567 it was Decreed, That the Trinity is to be Piously, and Religiously Retain'd on this Condition, that Brotherly love, according to the Rule given, by the Son of God be observ'd, each one bearing with the Infirmities of one another, &c. The

The Orthodox adhered so firmly to the use of those *Terms* (as what did most clearly express the Truth and Distinguish it from Error,) that the *Socinian* Party judg'd it convenient to continue the use of these *Terms*, and therefore had their *Trinity* too : tho they opposed a *Trinity of Persons* in the Godhead ; yet they still professed to believe in God the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*.

Andreas Dudicius, in an Epistle to *Beza*, sets before him a Confession of the *Socinian* Faith, and the *Athanasian Creed*, with his reasonings on the one, and the other : Their Confession is very short in these Words.

" We believe in one only True God ; The " Creator of Heaven and Earth, and of all " things in them, or elsewhere, *Gen. 1. 24.* <sup>*Socini
Oper. Tom.*</sup> *i. p. 529.*

" *Ex. 20. Deut. 4. 6. 27. 32.* — see the " *Refutation of Johannes Sommerus, Lib. 1.* " *cap. 4.* We believe also in our Lord Je-

" *sus Christ*, by whom are all things —

" *Cor. 8. &c. vid. ibid.* We believe that " the *Holy Ghost* is the Spirit of God the

" Father and Son, *Mat. 3. 10. Luc. 4.*

" *Rom. 8.* — That he proceeds from " the Father, *Job. 15.* That he is given to " them, who believe, by the Son, *Titus 3.*

" *vid. Sommerum. Lib. 2. cap. ult. pag.*

" 171.

" Besides, whatever else is in the Holy " Scriptures ascribed to the most High God, " or to his Son Jesus Christ, or to the Ho- " ly Ghost, which thro' haste we may have " omitted, we do most readily, and with the " Profoundest Submission, ascribe to them,

N

" most

" most sincerely confess, and without the
" least Hesitation believe.

I will add but one Authority more to clear this, which you may see in the *Polonian Catechism*, where they do not only acknowledge, that *Mat. 28. 19. 1 Cor. 12. 4,5,6,7.* and *1 Job. 5. 7.* do shew, there is the Father, Son, and *Holy Ghost*; and that they are United; but they constantly assert it. So that, say they, " we declare, that he, " who is ignorant of this Doctrine, or doth " not believe it, cannot be a *Christian*.

This Notion after much Deliberation had of it, is Published as theirs by *Crellius*, *Slichtingius a Bukowiec*, *Martin Ruarus*, and *Andreas Wissowatius*, and not only embraced by the *Foreign*, but by the *English Socinians*, as appears from what is in their *Unitarian History*, and in *Biddle's Confession*, which by Reprinting, and Placing it in the Collection of their Writers, they have made their *Own*.

In this Confession it's declared, " that " they believe, there is one most High God, " Creator of Heaven, and Earth, and that " this God is none but the Father of our " Lord Jesus Christ the *first Person* of the " *Holy Trinity*. — They believe, there " is one *Chief Son* of the High God; and " this Son of the most High God, is none " but Jesus Christ the *Second Person* in the " Trinity. They believe that there is com- " prized in the *Holy Trinity*, the *Holy Spi- " rit*, the Minister of God, and Christ.

But

But tho' they believe a *Holy Trinity*, yet they cannot agree about what this Holy Trinity is. They are *Three Persons*, as *Rau-rus*, *Przipcovius*, *John Biddle*, and his Followers affirm: They are but *Two* in the Judgment of *Socinus*, *Sclichtingius*, *Crel-lius* and the Generality of 'em both at home and abroad, whose Sentiments I will examine, and begin with what they say of the *Holy Ghost*.

1. The *Holy Ghost* is, in their Opinion, one of the Three, but not a *Person*; nor *God*, nor a *Creature*.

In their Attempts to Explain this Notion, they heap up Mystery upon Mystery, even such Mysteries, as seem to our dull Understandings, as full of Contradictions as a Mystery of the grossest sort can be: For they Acknowledge, that what is Peculiar unto *God*, is *Attributed to the Holy Ghost*, yea his very Eternity, "That the "Holy Ghost is a thing truly *Divine* and "Eternal, and the *Third* in order with "Respect to the Father, and the Son, and "proceeding from the Father and the Son, "we shall, (faith *Sclichtingius*) easily agree *Cont. Meis.* "with them in, but yet deny him to be *God*. P. 604. And altho' it's natural for us to suppose that Being, which is not *God*, and yet exists, to be a *Creature*, they are express that he is neither *God* nor *Creature*.

In *Graverus*, the Controversie about the *Pol. Sacr.* Spirits being the *Third Person* in the *God-* p. 635. *head*, is fairly stated; where, among other Things, he acquaints us with a Dispute

between *Ostorodius*, and *Tradelius*. “In this Dispute *Tradelius* arguing against the Socinian Notion, said, That in his Opinion, if the Holy Spirit be not God, seeing every Thing that is, is either a Creator, or his Creature, he must necessarily be his Creature.

To him *Ostorodius* thus replied. 1. “Tis one thing to say, that an Absurdity flows from such a Man’s Notion ; another to say, that this Man holds the Absurdity : For Doctor *Tradelius* doth not only endeavour to draw from what I hold, that the Holy Spirit is a Creature, but saith Categorically, that I am of Opinion, That the Holy Ghost is a Creature : A thing, that never came into my Mind : For on the contrary I affirm, that if the *Holy Spirit* be the Power of God, he is not a Creature ; for the Power of God is not Created. (2) I further say, that tho’ the Holy Spirit be not God twill not immediately follow, that he is a Creature ; for that Maxim, *Omne quod Creator non est, est Creatura*, is Uncertain ; For the Justice, Love, Grace and other Properties and Attributes of God, are not Creatures, nor are they God in that sense *Tradelius* will have the Holy Spirit to be God.

Thus far *Ostorodius* ; who delivering the Socinian sense, saith, That the Holy Spirit is neither God nor a Creature, but a Somewhat between them both ; tho’ the Opposition between God and the Creature is

is so immediate, that *non datur Tertium*, Yet contrary to the Plainest Reason, the *Socinians* Affirm the Holy Spirit to be an Eternal *Somewhat*, that is neither Creator, nor Creature. A Contradiction so gross, that it cannot be either solv'd or covered by *Ostrodius* his Allusion to the Attributes of God; for tho' they are not *God* in the Sense *Tradelius* faith the Holy Ghost is God, that is, they are not God Personally, yet they are Essentially, and are Infinite; and whatever is Infinite is *God*: Infinite Justice is God, and yet not many Gods but One, because there can be but One Infinite.

If then the Holy Ghost be the *Power* of God, it is either *Finite*, or *Infinite*: If *Finite*, it can't be *Eternal*, it must have a Beginning, receive its being from another, and be a *Creature*; If *Infinite*, it is *God*; or, somewhat *besides God* is *Infinite*, that is to say, there are *Two Infinites* the One *God*, the other not, which to our understandings is Contradiction all over.

How they can come off, I cannot see, especially considering another Opinion of theirs, which is, That tho' it be a Sin to Worship the *Holy Ghost*, yet it's not Idolatry to do so.

Sclichtingius doth, I confess, with much Candour towards us, endeavour to Vindicate p. 11, 12. our Worshipping the *Holy Ghost* from being Idolatry; tho' he be not *God*. But thus much he doth, by affirming that there is so close an Union between the *Holy Ghost*, and the most High *God*; that the giving

Divine Worship to him, cannot be either *Impious* or *Idolatrous*. And in his Answer to what *Meisner* urged, from the Attribution of the Divine Properties to the Holy Ghost, in Proving him to be God; he turns it all off, by saying, That doth not Evince the Holy Ghost to be a Person, but it is sufficient to my Purpose, that they Acknowledge the Holy Ghost to be *as Divine, as Infinite, and Eternal*, as the Attributes of God are, seeing hereby they must either own him to be God; or that somewhat besides God is Infinite.

II. As they say the Holy Ghost is neither a Creature nor God, so on the other hand, they make Christ to be but a *Creature*; and yet to be *God* also.

1. They affirm Jesus Christ to be a *True God*; *True*, in Opposition to the False Gods of the *Gentiles*, who are indeed False Gods, because they are Gods without a *Deity*: A God without a Deity is a false God because he wants Infinite Perfection; a true God then hath Infinite Perfections, and therefore must be the most High God, except there are Perfections more High than what are *Infinite*.

But thus much they Deny, tho' Christ be a true God, yet he is not the *Most High God*. He is but a *Subordinate God* in his Essence. This then is their Notion, Christ is a True Subordinate God, i. e. A True God whose Perfections are Infinite; a Subordinate God in his Essence whose Perfections can be but *Finite*, and therefore can be no God at all. Again,

2. Christ

2. Christ is, they say, God, on the Father's giving him Absolute Dominion over all things, with a Power, and Knowledge, whereby he knoweth the Distresses of all, and is able to Relieve the Distressed; But, seeing Nothing, short of *Omniscience*, and *Omnipotence*, can know, and Relieve, and these together with absolute *Dominion*, are Essential Properties of the Most High God, How comes it to pass, that Christ is not the most High God? Here are the Essential Properties of such a God, and yet no such God.

These are some of their Mysteries. The Holy Ghost is an Eternal Omnipotent In-create Being, but not God. He is neither a Creator, nor a Creature, but an Omnipotent Somewhat, different from Both: In-create or Unoriginated Omnipotence is not sufficient to evince the Eternal Spirit to be God; but a Derived Omnipotence is enough to make a Creature to be a True God. Unoriginated Omnipotence is not Reason enough for the adoring the Eternal Spirit; but Derived Omnipotence is a good Ground for Rendring Divine Worship to a Creature. These Gentlemen, you see, are the *Grand Transubstantiators*; for they can *Transubstantiate* a Creature into a *True God*, and still remain a Creature, they can Transfer the Essential Properties from one being to another; and each Being remain the same it was before the Translation; They can Order and Dispose of the Divine Properties in such a Way, that they shall be insufficient to De-

nominate him a True God, in whom they were from all Eternity, and yet be Powerful enough to make him, in whom they were not two Thousand Years ago, to be a True God. Whether these are Real Mysteries, or Real Contradictions, let the Prudent judge.

I will not treat these Over-Wise Men with that Scurrilous Language they do the Mysteries of the Holy Trinity; But without Exaggeration I will proceed to Examine what they say of *God the Father.*

III. That *God the Father* is only the most High God, is their Assertion; of whom they have nevertheless form'd such an Idea as fails of Infinite Perfections. So that if we pursue their Notion of a Deity to its utmost Length, we must at last sit down amongst the *Atheists.*

For the clearing this, I do in Concourse with the Common sentiments of Mankind, averr, that what Being soever is destitute of an Infinite Perfection is not, cannot be God. The Essential Properties belong to the Divine Nature, including Infinite Perfection; that being which is destitute thereof, wants what is Essential to God, and cannot be the True God.

If then the *Socinians* deny any one Infinite Perfection to belong to their God, it must be acknowledged, that he wants what is essential unto God, and is not God. And that they Deny thus much, is Evident, from the Notion they frame of his Eternity, and their Rejecting his *Imminency* and *Omniscience.*

I might

I might begin with what they say of God's Eternity, but I will only observe what the English Socinian saith of my *Lord of Worcester's* arguing from God's Eternity, to prove *Somewhat* in the Attributes of God incomprehensible, who instancing in Eternity, saith, "If God was from Eternity he must be from himself. In their Answer Ansf. to the
Bp. Worces.
Serm. p. 5. they tell us, "To say a Person, or Thing was from it self, is a Contradiction. It implies this Contradiction, It was before it was, Thus our English Socinian; who adds, "I am sorry an Eternal God must be a Contradiction, had he no way to defend the New Mysteries, but by expounding the Cause of Atheists?"

In Return to this Gentleman, passing by what his *Lordship* hath said in his Confutation of him, I will only observe, how he doth at once expose himself, and his Leaders, such as *Socinus, Crellius, &c.* who speaking of what is the *Essence of God*, say it is *from it self*.

Socinus, in his Institution of the Christian Religion, answering the Question, Tom. 1. p.
651. "What ought we to know of the Nature, and Essence of God? faith, These two Things chiefly, That he is, and that He is only One. Quest. What is it to know, That He is? Ansf. It is to know, that he hath from himself a Divine Empire over us. Besides, He tells us, that Eternity is necessarily included in God's having Divine Dominion over us from Himself, and so is his Justice, Wisdom, and Power. A little after

after this, he further saith, That when it's said God is One; The meaning is, There is but one who hath Dominion over us *from himself*. In like manner the Tenth Argument *Crellius* presleth to prove, that the Father of Jesus Christ is the only Supreme God, is this, That his Nature and whatever else is proper to the Supreme God, he receiv'd *from Himself*.

Abi. Sup.
p. 681.

On this Notion of God it is, that they build the whole of their Religion, and on which they insist, to the End they may the more effectually enervate our Arguments for Christ's being God tho' from the Father. But as *Socinus, Crellius, &c.* fail of their Design, in that when it's said, God is *from Himself*, it must be meant of *God*, taken *Essentially*, not *Personally*; so, this Gentleman makes the whole of the *Socinian* Religion to be founded on a *Chimera or Contradiction*. For, if the *Nature of God*, his Dominion, Eternity, Justice, Wisdom, and Power, be *from Himself*, he must be before he had Dominion, Justice, &c. What then was He? He was, before he was; or as the English *Socinian* phrases it, *He must be a Contradiction*. But as I said, waving the Consideration of this Contradiction, and their Notion of *Eternity*, which they make to be a sort of *Time*, where are the successive Parts of *Past, Present*, and to *Come*, which cannot be without a First, Second, and a Third, and yet must be without 'em, or Eternity must have it's Beginning. I will urge against them their denying *Immenity* and *Omniscience* to belong to God.

First

First then, they deny God's Immensity, and Circumscribe his Essence within the Heavens, acknowledging him to be no other-wise every where Present, than as he is by his Power, Providence, and Works.

Socinus affureth us, he could see no Reason to conclude God's Essence to be Immense, Soci. Frag. Catec. Tom. I. p. 685. because his Power was so; expressly declaring,

That the Divine Essence is not Infinite. *Crelilius*, and *Smalcianus* hold the same. But Resp. ad. Franc. Dz. if God's Essence be not Infinite, tis only v. Tom. 2. p. 735. Finite; if but Finite, how can his Power be Infinite? can, a Finite Essence be the subject of an Infinite Perfection? Or can a Finite Being be from it self? or be self-Originated? Or can any one Finite Essence be so Great, that another cannot be as Great? After this manner we may have Twenty or Thirty Thousand Gods as well as One. But a Million of these put together, cannot make One Infinite God. Thus by denying the Divine Essence to be Infinite, they Oppose God's Immensity, and do their Part to give up the Cause to the Atheist.

Secondly, They deny also God's Omnipotence, which necessarily follows from the other; it being impossible for the Knowledge of a Finite Being to be Infinite.

After *Socinus* had discoursed very largely of *Divine Prescience*, he Ushers in his Conclusion thus, " Seeing therefore there is no Reason, nor One Text of Scripture from which it can be clearly inferred, that God knoweth all things, which are done before they come to pass. We must

" Conclude,

Præc.

Theol.

c. ii.

P. 549.

" *Conclude*, that we may in no wise Affert
" his Divine Prescience : especially, consi-
" dering there are Reasons not a few, as
" well as sundry Testimonies in Holy Writ,
" from whence it plainly appears that we
ought to deny it. *Smalcius* and *Crellius*
say the same. And *Episcopius* himself would
have fall'n in with 'em, had it not been,
that all *Prophecies* must then have been de-
stroyed. From this Notion of theirs, in
the first place, Revealed Religion receives a
Wound ; for if God doth not know *Future*
Contingents, how can he *Foretell* them ? And if he can't Foretell them, of what Use
is the Prophetiacal Part of the Holy Scrip-
tures ? And if they must be rejected, as use-
less, will not the *Deists* be Abundantly
Gratified ? Or, if it be yielded that God
doth not *foreknow* Future Contingents,
'twill necessarily follow, that his Knowledge
is not Infinuite, and he can't be God.

These few, amongst many Instances, may
suffice, to Convince us, that the *Socinians*,
whatever their Boasts are, have no Reason
for the exposing the Doctrine of the *Holy*
Trinity, as they have done ; nor for their
Railing at Gospel-Mysteries, as if they had
been full of Monstrous Contradictions. For
you see, that they have their *Trinity* too,
a Trinity throughout *Mysterious* ; for, as
they make the Holy Ghost an Increase Om-
nipotent Spirit, but not God, and Jesus
Christ to be but a Creature, and yet a God,
a True, tho' but a Subordinate God ; so God
the Father, the most High God, is left
by

by them destitute of Infinite Perfections. His Essence is but Finite, and therefore without a Contradiction cannot be infinitely Perfect.

Their Trinity you see is a most Mysterious one, and their *Unitarianism* lyeth in the Belief of Two distinct Gods, a Greater and a Lesser, to wit the *Father* and his Son Jesus Christ; which issues in the Denial of an Infinite God. For which Reason, amongst others, *Mr. Edwards* hath very justly charged their Principles, for being *Atheistical*, as *Bisterfield* accuses them for their Tendency unto *Paganism*, whilst He is so Charitable as to hope they see it not.

*Adversari
is merito
exprobra-
mus, quod*

*ximum verum Deum agnoscere nolunt, Duos Deos in Ecclesiam in-
troducunt, sicque si id omne credeatur esset, quod ex ipsorum Opini-
one necessario sequitur, Paganismum revocent, ac stabilitant, ipso-
met Paganismi non accusamus: speramus enim, quod non videant
absurdissima hac dogmata ex ipsorum Doctrina necessaria sequi, &c.
Bisterfield contra Crel. de Uno Deo, Lib. I. sect. 2. cap. 18.*

Much more might be said of our *Socini-
ans*, but being Apprehensive that what I
have Remark'd is sufficient to move such as
are ensnared by their Crafty and Deceitful
Guides, to consider how much they are Con-
cern'd to take heed to themselves. I will at
this time forbear.

S E C T.

S E C T. X.

The Agreement between the English Socinians, and the Mahometans Detected. They both Believe Jesus the Son of Mary to be the Messiah. Sundry other Instances, wherein they are Agreed. They both Deny Christ's Divinity, and the giving to him Divine Adoration. The Impostor Mahomet a Lascivious Wretch, who Propagated his Religion by Force of Arms.

THE Good Opinion our *English Socinians* have of the *Turkish Religion*; whose Embracers, they place in a nearer Proximity to *Salvation* than Orthodox Christians, moved me to Enquire, whether they had, according to their own *Principles*, any Reason for their *Charity* towards a People, whose Religion is as full of *Blasphemy*, as their Souls are of Rancour against us Christians: And after the most *Free* and *Impartial* Disquisition, it appeared unto me, that the *Principles* which themselves Affirm to be most *Important*, are so very much the same, That our *Socinians* may be justly styled *English Turks*, and the *Turks English Socianized Christians*.

I do not say, That every *English Socian* doth understand the Principal Articles of his

his own, or of the *Mahometan*, Religion; much less, that they Design to Introduce *Mahometanism*. There are, I am Confident, many amongst us, who Love the *Socinians*, but know very little of their *Socinianism*. They are startled at the Noise raised against the Orthodox, their Systematical Niceties, and Obscurities, their Mysteries, and Contradictions, and the like; but hereby they are more set against the *Truth*, than disposed to close with their Errors; and are so far from taking in the whole of their new Scheme; that, did they but see what it is, and what are its Tendencies, they would Abhor it.

For the sake of these, I will shew what Arts are used by their Leaders, in the Representations they make of the *Mahometans*, which they must be esteemed to do either with a Design to give such an Advantage to the *Papists* against Protestants now, as the *Socinians* gave heretofore unto *Reynolds* and *Gifford*, to write their *Calvino-Turcismus*; or, to bring in the *Turkish Religion* amongst us; or, rather, knowing how False the *Papist*, and how Ridiculous as well as Elaphemous the *Mahometan Religion* is, to take the People off from all Religion, that they may the more easily take up with *Deism*, or *Atheism*.

Thus one, speaks (as I have already noted,) so Honourably of *Mahomet*, and so much of the Future Happiness of the *Mahometans*; and another, whom I cannot but Respect for his learning, hath, in his Reasonableness

sonableness of Christianity, reduced the Vital Principles of our Holy Religion to what is receiv'd into the *Alcoran*. " This was,
 " faith the Author of this Discourse, the
 Reasonab.
 of Chriſti.
 p. 26. &c.
 P. 192.

" Great Proposition that was controverted
 " concerning Jesus of Nazareth, whether
 " He was the Messiah or no? And the Af-
 " sent to that was that which distinguished
 " Believers from Unbelievers. — That
 " this is the sole Doctrine, Profess'd, and
 " Required to be Believ'd in the whole Te-
 " rour of our Saviours, and his Apostles
 " Preaching we have shew'd through the
 " whole History of the Evangelists, and the
 " Acts. And, I challenge them (faith
 " he) to shew, that there was any other
 " Doctrine upon their Assent to which, or
 " Disbelief of it, men were Pronounced Be-
 " lievers or Unbelievers.

Thus you see, that the whole of Christianity is brought within the Compass of these few words, *To believe that Jesus of Nazareth, or Jesus the son of Mary, is the Messiah.* They that Believe thus much, are Good Christians, such as were " Received
 " into the Church of Christ, as Members
 " of his Body, as far as meer believing could
 " make them so.

Now I say, that according to this Principle the Mahometans are good Christians, and ought to be Receiv'd into the Church of Christ, as Members of his Body. For they do Profess to believe, *That Jesus the Son of Mary is the Messiah;* in the second Chapter of the *Alcoran*, " Certainly we
 " gave

" gave the Law to *Moses*, and after him
" sent many Prophets: We Inspired Know-
" ledge into *Jesus* the Son of *Mary*, and
" Strengthened him by the *Holy Ghost*. In
" the next Chapter, The Angels called
" *Zachary* and said unto him, I Declare to
" thee from God, that thou shalt have a *Son*,
" called *John*, he shall affirm the *Messias* to
" be the *word of God*; that he shall be a
" Great Person, Chaste; a Prophet, and one
" of the Just. — Remember thou, how
" the Angels said, Oh ! *Mary*, God De-
" clareth unto thee a *word*, from which shall
" Proceed the *Messias*, named *Jesus*, the
" Son of *Mary*, full of Honour in this
" World, and that shall be in the other of
" the Number of *Intercessors*, with his
" Divine Majesty — I will teach him
" the Scriptures, the *Mysteries* of the Law,
" the Old *Testament*, and the *Gospel*, and
" He shall be a Prophet sent to the Chil-
" dren of *Israel*. *Jesus* said to the Chil-
" dren of *Israel*, I come to you with evident
" signs of my *Mission* from your *Lord* —
" I am come to you with Signs of my *Mis-*
" *sion*, that *Testifie* that I am truly sent
" from your *Lord* — Remember thou
" how the Lord God said, O *Jesus* I will
" cause thee to Die, I will Raise thee to
" my self, and Remove thee far from In-
" fidels, and Prefer those that have
" Obeyed thee to Infidels, at the Day of
" Judgment. And of the *Jews*, (in the
fourth Chapter,) it's said, " God Imprint-
" ed Infidelity in their Hearts, they shalt

O

" never

" never Believe in his Law, except very Few
 " of them, because of their *Malice*, and
 " the *blasphemies*, they *Vomited* against
 " *Mary*. They said, we have slain the *Mess-
 Chap. 5.
 Chap. 61.
 siab, Jesus the Son of Mary, the Prophet
 " and Apostle of God: —— The *Messiah*
 " the Son of *Mary* is a Prophet and Apostle
 " of God. —— Remember thou, that
 " *Jesus* the son of *Mary*, said to the Chil-
 " dren of *Israel*; I am the *Messenger* of
 " God; He hath sent me to Confirm the
 " Old Testament — so far the *Alcoran*.*

Mahumed Ben Achmed, an Eminent
 Interpreter of the *Alcoran* by [His word]
 understands [the Son,] which when spoken
 absolutely, points us only unto the *Son of
 Lib. 1. c. 1.
 God*: *Elmacinus*, in his *History of the Saracens*, faith, that the *Mahometans* hold
 Christ the Son of Mary to be the Son of
 God. And, as *Borcardus*, The *Saracens* do
 affirm, and confess Christ to be truly the
Son of God: Besides, it's also said, that they
 p. 1. c. 7.
*De Ter. S.
 Sect. 12.*
 believe *Jesus Christ* to be the Son of God,
 Ascended into Heaven, setting on the *Right*
 hand of the Father, and *Mahomet* on the
Left. Thus *Sandius* in his *Church History*
*Hist. Enuc.
 tib. 3. Sec. 7.*
 p. 82, &c. so much Admired by our *English Socinians*.
 Now seeing what our Author Insists on as
Necessary to make a man a *True Believer*, is
 in the *Turkish Alcoran*, I wou'd fain know,
 whether the *Mahometans*, who Believe these
 Points, are not in his Esteem such Christians
 as ought to be Received into the Church
 of Christ, as Members of his Body? What is
 it that He requires as necessary to our being
 such

Of the Growth of Error. 19;

such that the *Turks* do not profess to hold? Doth not he enjoy them to Believe, that *Jesus* the *Son of Mary*, is the *Messiah* sent of God, (which he proved by Miracles) that he Dyed, Rose again, and is on the Right Hand of the Omnipotent God? The *Turks* Believe the same. Will he have us worship *Christ* but not with that Adoration which is due to the most High God? The *Turks* will do it, so *Sandius*. *Christum esse adorandum, sed non eo summo Cultu,* ^{Hi. 2. Chap.} *quo Adoratur ejus Dominus & Deus.* ubi sup.
Doth he say, that *Jesus* is more highly exalted than *Mahomet* himself? *Mahomet* in his *Alcoran* grants it; not only that *Jesus* is on the Right Hand, and himself on the Left, but that he is Inferior to the *Blessed Virgin*, the Mother of our Lord So *Sandius* out of *Bellonius, Cusanus, Richardson*, and others. Doth He Require us to Believe that *Christ* Dyed, Rose again, and that there shall be a *Resurrection of our Souls and Bodies?* the *Turks* Believe it. Will he have it, that *Christ* shall Appear *Personally*, and erect a Glorious Kingdom on Earth when all must Believe in him? The *Mahometans* say the same, only they will allow unto *Jesus* but forty, not a thousand years for his *Personal Reign*. Doth he Require us to Believe the Old and New Testament to be *Inspired*? It is no more than what is affirm'd in their *Alcoran* where it's express, that God sent *Mahomet* to Confirm the *Scriptures*, namely the Old Testament and the *Gospel*, that God *Inspir-*

Chap. 2.

ed into him to Confirm the Ancient Scripture. And Nicholaus Cardinal de Cusa, in the Prologue to his *Cibratio Alcorani*, saith, that *Balthasar de Luparis*, sometime a Merchant at Constantinople, oft told him that the *Mahometan Doctors* did greatly respect and love the *Gospel*, preferring it to the Book of their own Law: That one of the most Learned of their Doctors being Instructed out of the *Gospel of John*, touching the Truth, Proposed to *Balthasar* his Design of going to *Rome* with Twelve others, might he have safe Conduct, which the *Cardinal de Cusa* procured; but the Learned Turk was hindred by Death. And *Sandius*, out of *Eocardus Reports*, That these *Saracens* have *Saint John* in the Highest Esteem, next unto *Jesus Christ*, and the Blessed Virgin, counting Him the greatest, and most Holy amongst the Prophets. Doth our Author urge the Necessity of Repentance? The *Turks* presl the same, as necessary unto the *Pardon of Sin*, though not of that Sin which is unto Death. What then is it that can hinder their being good Christians in the Judgment of our English *Socinians*? Or, seeing our *Socinians* believe no more touching what they judge necessary to Salvation, than the *Turks* do; what is it that makes them better *Christians* than the *Mahometans* are?

Our Author is pleased to challenge Us, to shew, that there is any other Doctrine; upon our Assent to which, or Disbelief of it, Men were pronounced Believers or Unbelievers.

Put

But I crave leave to tell him, amongst other Doctrines, that of Christ's Divinity is one. If he will consult John 5. 18, 23, 24, &c. He'll find it to be clearly Revealed, and sufficiently proved by the Lord Jesus Himself, that the Belief of his being God, Equal with the Father, is so necessary, that without it, we can't be pronounced Believers

The Holy Evangelist, in the Account he gives of the Discourse that was between Christ, and the Jews, expressly declares, that the Jews sought to kill Jesus; because he said, that God was his Father, making Himself equal with God. Notwithstanding which, the Lord Jesus went on to the Proofs, assuring them, that His doing the same Works which the Father doth, doth evince him to be God, *equal with the Father*; adding, that the Father hath so committed all Judgment unto the Son, that *all Men should Honour the Son, even as they Honour the Father*: That is, with the same Honour, Worship, and Adoration: For, he that Honoureth not the Son, Honoureth not the Father, which has sent him; which Words do plainly shew, that 'tis the Will of the Father, That we believe his Son Jesus to be God, equal with himself. For a rendering the *same Honour* to the Son which is due unto the Father, carrieth in it, an Ascription of those Essential Perfections of God to him, which make him to be God, equal with the Father; which cannot be lawfully done by any, but such as believe

him to be so ; as appears not only from the Nature of the thing, but from *Rom. 10. 14.* where it's said, that we can't call, or give Divine Honour to him, in whom we have not believed. If then Honouring the Son as we Honour the Father be so necessary a Duty, that they who neglect it do not Honour the Father, a believing the Son to be God, in the same Sense the Father is God, is so necessary, as a believing the Father to be God; which is so very necessary, that on the Disbelief of it, Men were pronounced Unbelievers

This is, I confess, a *Parting Point*, between Orthodox Christians on the one Hand, and the *Mahometans*, and *English Socinians* on the other. For, if Assent to this Doctrine, viz. That Jesus Christ is God, equal with the Father, be so necessary, that without it, we can't be pronounced Believers, they who disbelieve it, cannot be Christians ; whence it is, that the *Mahometans*, and *English Socinians*, denying the Divinity of Christ, and the lawfulness of rendering to him Divine Worship, are for the same Reason, link'd together, as *Enemies* to the *Christian Religion*.

The most learned, and sober amongst Foreign Socinians, being aware of this; tho', they denied Christ's Deity, yet urged the giving Divine Worship unto Christ, as necessary to the distinguishing themselves from the *Mahometans*, and proving themselves to be good Christians. But the *English Socinians* falling in with *Franciscus Davidis*, and

and that Party in *Poland*, are of opinion, that they must be guilty of Idolatry, if they give Divine Worship to him that is but a Creature; and to escape Idolatry, refuse to give to the Son, Divine Worship, and so put it out of their Power to prove themselves to be better Christians than the *Turks* are, or to plead their own Cause without defending the *Mahometans*; which as I take it, is the true Reason; why the more Learned amongst them do write so *Respectfully*, and *Charitably* of these *Ishmaelites*, and do, not only speak Honourably of the Impostor *Mahomet's* Design, as if it had been only to reform the *Christian Religion*; but assign the Reason of the *Propagation* of that Religion, not to the *Sword*, but to their *Denial of the Blessed Trinity*. And yet it is most manifest, that *Mahomet*, a very vicious Man, being under the Conduct of *Sergius*, a *Nestorian*, did, by his Assistance, invent a Religion, with a Design, if possible, to please the *Pagan*, *Jew*, and *Christian*; and, considering the Ignorance and Debauchery of the People amongst whom he was; He prepar'd such a *Heav'n* for them who observed his *Alcoran*, as mostly suited their sensual and voluptuous Dispositions: And, being himself a most lascivious Wretch, whilst he would by his *Alcoran* restrain others, pretends to have an Indulgence from Heaven, for the Gratification of his own Lusts.

Thus the Amorous Prophet being taken with the Beauty of his Slave, *Zeid's* Wife, obliged *Zeid* to Repudiate her, bringing in

Chap. 33. the one God, saying ; " When Zeid did Repudiate his Wife, we married thee to her, to the End there might remain no Error among the *True Believers* — — — *The Prophet sins not in doing what God has permitted* — O Prophet, we permit thee to know the Women to whom thou hast giyen Dowry, the Women slaves, which God hath given thee, the Daughters of thine Uncles, and of thine Aunts, that have abandon'd with thee the Company of the Wicked ; — Thou shalt retain whom of thy Wives thou shalt desire to retain ; and shalt repudiate such as thou shalt desire to repudiate, and shalt lie with them that shall please thee.

Thus much out of the *Alcoran*, where tis also said, that amongst his Slaves (which were many) he might, if their Beauty pleased him, make exchanges ; and least his *lascivious* Practices should encourage his Wives to do the like with True Believers ; He charges his Believers not to come into his Houses without Permission ; and when permitted, not to tarry long, for that molesteth the Prophet ; and, modest Man, *he is ashamed* to bid them be gone. — — — The Wives of the Prophet shall have their Faces covered when they speak unto 'em ; they ought not to importune the Prophet of God, neither to know his Wives, this would be a most Enormous Sin.

Besides, Mahomet did constantly Preach, that God had sent him to confirm his Law

by

by Force of Arms, and not by Miracles. This is so notoriously true, that it cannot but amaze the least acquainted with the Turkish Stories, to hear any Pretender to Learning affirm, that *Mahomet* was against forcing any to a Closure with his *Blasphemies*.

Though they proclaimed Liberty to all that would submit to their *Alcoran*; yet, so far resolv'd on the propagating their Religion by Force, that no Truce could prevent their using violent Methods, when they had a Tendency to promote their Design; whence it is, that in the *Alcoran*, the ninth Chapter, entituled by the *Mahometan* Doctors [the *Chapter of Punishment*] but by *Mahomet* [the *Chapter of Conversion*] beginneth not as the rest, with these Words [in the Name of God, *Gracious and Merciful*] because these are Words of Peace and Salvation; and *Mahomet*, in this Chapter, commands to break Truce with his Enemies: “To
“ kill them where-ever they shall meet them,
“ take them Slaves, detain them Prisoners,
“ and observe where they pass, to lay Ambush for them; But if they be converted,
“ if they pray at time Appointed, and pay
“ Tithes, leave them in Quiet, God is
“ merciful to them that repent.

Whether the lascivious, and bloody Mindedness of this *Mahomet*, and his Partizans be some of the *Trifles* of whom *Sandius* speaks, who, after he had given the fairest Representation of the Faith and *Morals* of the *Turks*, adds, *Cetera, que in Alcorano*

corano invenimus, sunt mere nugæ, I submit to the Reader, it being to me very clear, that they who would be Advocates for *Mahomet*, or *his Religion*, have very little Reason for their Pretences to *Sobriety*, or *Liberty of Conscience*, which is no otherwise granted by them than as it's subservient to their secular Interests. And touching that ingenious Gentleman, who under the plausible Covert of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, hath lopt off so many of the most Essential Parts of Christ's Religion, as to defend no more of it, than that *Grand Impostor Mahomet* would have done ; he has, I think, done no service at all to Christianity ; and it must be acknowledged, that those *English Socinians*, who write so Honourably of *Mahomet*, his *Design*, and *Religion*, may be more justly look'd on as *Pensioners* of the *Great Turk*, than the learned Opposers of *Socinian Heresies* can be represented as the *Grand Pensioner* of the World.

The CONCLUSION.

THESE are some of those Methods, which the *Arminians*, the *Foreign* and *English Socinians* have taken to Instill, and Propagate their Errours, which, for the Help of the less studied, I will reduce to the Following Heads.

Sect. I.

Sect. I. These Gentlemen, not being able to comprehend some of the most Important Points of Christian Religion, because of their *Mysteriousness*, do reject them as Contradictious, and Unreasonable. On this Ground the *Socinians* Explode the Doctrines of the Blessed *Trinity*, and *Incarnation*, *Christ's Satisfaction*, and that *Mystical Union* which is betwixt Him and Believers; And the *Arminians* Oppugn the *Absolute and Eternal Decrees*, together with the *Irresistible Operations of Grace* in the Conversion of Sinners.

But that they may the more consistently Prosecute their Design they find themselves necessitated to Frame such an *Idea of God*, as comes short of a Being Infinitely Perfect, and thus lead their *Followers* into *Atheism*. Chap. 1.

Sect. II. The Erroneous finding in their corrupt Hearts an *Innate Antipathy* against Justification by the Righteousness of another; do, endeavour to establish a Righteousness of their own. To compas thus much, the more Learned, knowing that there is an *Eternal Law of Right*, of which no one Precept or Rule is, or can be *Abrogated*, or *Repealed*, whilst God is an Holy, Just and Righteous God, and Man a rational Creature, do hold, that this is the *Law*, by which all Men shall be judged at the last day. Only those, who have believed *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, and have taken Him to be their *King*, with a sincere Endeavour after

after Righteousness, in obeying his Law, shall have their past Sins not imputed to them : And shall have that *Faith* taken instead of *Obedience*, that is, their *Faith* shall be taken for a *Compleat Performance of this Law*, where by Imperfection is stretched to the utmost length of Perfection : But the more unlearned, to escape this Rock, have vacated the *Penal Sanction* of the old Law; and erected a *New*, which threatens no Sins but final Unbelief, and Impenitence, with Eternal Death, who must hold, that no other Sins but Unbelief and Impenitence are in their own Nature mortal and deadly, deserving everlasting Misery ; or, at least by setting up this *New Law*, to the End imperfect *Obedience* may answer their *New Rule*, they must make all their *Deficiencies*, which by the Eternal Law were *Sins*, to be no Sins at all ; and thus framing their Rule to our Imperfections, instead of Christ's Righteousness they constitute one of their own for Justification. And to make out these things they give us a *New Scheme* of Divinity, more suited to the *Socinian*, than *Gospel Rule*, though it must be acknowledged, that these Gentlemen, and some others nearly allied unto 'em by Principles, observing, how unsuccessful the Candour, and Sincerity of Foreign *Socinians* hath been, in owning the Genuine Import of *some Phrases*, which, because expressive of what they approved not, they rejected; these Gentlemen have imposed a *wrong sense* on 'em, and in the Controversies about *Christ's Satisfaction*

tisfaction retained their Use, and pervert the Truth in this important Article of our Holy Religion, *Cap. 2. & Cap. 3. Sect. 8. Pag. 82, &c.*

Sect. IV. That the Foreign *Socinians*, and *Arminians*, might the more easily propagate their Errors, they did at first appear under the Character of Men found in the Faith, using Orthodox Terms and Phrases, and subscribing the commonly received Catechisms and Confessions of Faith, whereby they gain'd great Reputation amongst the Orthodox. Thus was *Blandrata*, who (as *Calvin* saith) had nothing but *Pride* and *Ostentation* to recommend him, esteemed by Men of Eminence and Soundnes in the Faith, as the *Atlas*, that bears the Church on his Shoulders.

And thus other Men also of little Learning, great Industry, instigated by greater Pride, have by their Flatteries and deceitful Subscriptions to Orthodox Confessions insinuated themselves into the Hearts of well-meaning People, and lead 'em into Errors of a most pernicious Tendency, as hath been cleared in sundry Instances throughout *Chap. 5. & Chap. 4. Sect. 7.*

Sect. V. The *English Socinian* wanting both the Learning and Candour of their Brethren beyond the Seas, are not willing to abide by their Confessions, or Catechisms, nor are they prepared to emit any of their own Composure, and therefore they do studiously

diously labour to conceal what it is they are for, and bend their strength against the Truth, and turn themselves into any shape, may they thereby advance their Designs. If it be their Interest to profess, they are of the *Church of England*, or to plead the Cause of *Mahomet*, and reduce the Christian Religion to one Article, found in the Turkish *Alcoran*, they do it. And it must be confessed, that by their refusing to give Divine Worship to Jesus Christ, they have put it out of their Power to prove themselves to be better Christians than the *Mahometans* are; no wonder then, that they are sometimes for acting the Part of a *Quaker*, and again for pleading the Cause of the *Papists*, but any thing, every thing, rather than an *Orthodox Christian*. For as they cannot be held by Subscriptions, neither are the Blessed *Sacraments* sacred enough to bring 'em under Obligation. These are with them, but *Incantations, Charms, Spells, Norman Knots, &c.* and seeing no *spiritual Blessing* is in their Opinion, annexed to the *Right partaking of a Sacrament*, it cannot in any Christian Kingdom whatever, be a Test to keep them out of the Government, so wisely have they ordered their Affairs in matters Religious; that however it goeth with them in the *next World*, it may be well with them in *This*. See how these things are cleared, *Chap. 4. Sect. 1, 2. 4. 10.*

Sect. VI. And that they may the more easily impose their Dotages upon the *Unlearned,*

learned, They represent the Principles believed by the Orthodox to worse than *Judaism*, or *Mahometanism*; and as bad as *Egyptian* and *Roman Paganism*, Crying down Learning, and a learned Ministry, and most bitterly reviling their Judicious Adversaries. How virulently have they treated the Reformed Divines in *France*, and *Holland*? And with what Contempt and Scorn have they fall'n upon the Learned Clergy; not only Dr. *Bull*, but, amongst many others, on my Lord of *Worcester*, who may be justly styled, *Malleus Socinianorum*; And when this Art fails 'em, they tack about, and on a sudden pretend a Zeal for Learning, claiming a Right in the *Anti-Nicene Fathers*, and the first Reformers, such as *Luther*, and *Calvin*, and will have it that the Great *Hugo Grotius* is theirs. But their prentice are without the least shadow of Reason, and such as Vid. Ch. 4. are neglected by the more Learned of their *Sect. 3.5, &c.* own Way.

Sect. VII. To the End they may prepare a Place for their *Dagon*, their Care is to cast what *Reproach* they can on the *Blessed Trinity*, which they can't more effectually do, than by pleading for a *Trinity of Essences*; or a *Plurality of Gods*; which was the Master-piece of the *Italian Combination*. What Pranks these prevaticating Hereticks played, I have briefly intimated; a *Conspiracy*, which, in its Tendency, was not very different from that entered into by *Vaninus*, and twelve more, who went into divers Parts of the

*Chap. 4.
Sect. 8.*

the World, on purpose to propagate *Atheism*, as *Gualterius the Jesuit* (as I have some-where Read) doth, in his *Cronological Tables*, report. That there is a Combination of the same Nature with the Old *Italians* entred into by the *English Socinians*, who-ever will consult their Writings will see but little Reason to doubt of it. And when I come to shew what *Methods* have been taken to corrupt and subvert the *Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction*, I hope, &c. to show, that some have as industriously acted their Part, as if they had been in a Combination to bring that blessed Doctrine into doubt, which was a Branch of the Contrivance of *Lælius Socinus, Paruta, Ochinus*, and their Partizans. There is one thing more to be observed, it is this.

Sect. VIII. That notwithstanding their grievous out-cries against the *Gospel* of our Lord Christ, because of the *Mysteries*, which are in it, they have their *Trinity* and *Mysteries* too. Only they are not so sublime, nor so clearly revealed in *Scripture* as what we believe; and tho' full of Contradictions, yet without Scruple received by 'em. 'Tis true, they struggled hard to bury in an Eternal Oblivion, the Terms, *Trinity, Incarnation, &c.* because, as they said, not found in the Letter of the Sacred Text, which if they could have done, we should have heard nothing of their *Trinity*: But failing of Success here, as they retained the Term *Trinity*, so they substituted in the Place of a *Trinity of Persons* in the *Godhead*, a *Trinity of Somewhats* of their own Invention. *Ch. 4. Sect. 9.*

I shall trespass no further on my *Reader*, in the Repetition of what is done; and as for what else I have more to do, if God permit, and Prudence directs, I shall take my Time.

F I N I S.



